

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.**

Tuesday, October 2, 1962.

The SPEAKER (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

**QUESTIONS.****UNIVERSITY BUILDING PROGRAMME.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH: In this morning's *Advertiser*, under the heading of "South Australian University 'Impresses'", appeared the following report of a conference between the Commonwealth Universities Commission and local university authorities:

Important matters discussed were the capital grants required for the building programme on the university, Bedford Park and Waite Institute sites and the recurrent grants needed by the three institutions. Members of the commission will today confer with the Premier (Sir Thomas Playford), and tomorrow will meet members of the teaching staff.

Can the Premier say when the building programme at Bedford Park for university purposes is likely to commence and whether any provision has been made for the demolition of existing buildings or the building of a complete unit for the university there?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The University of Adelaide has placed before the Commonwealth Universities Commission proposals for the development of Bedford Park but, as far as I know, they do not deal with the demolition of buildings there at present. The commission has replied, has approved in principle of several submissions, and has modified some submissions. It has said, however, that it will not be able to make any financial grant until 1964. In the meantime, however, it has made some suggestions that were discussed by me with the commission this morning. This will be further covered by a letter from the commission regarding the appointment of some provisional staff. The university and the commission point out that this type of organization cannot be started without there being some planning behind it, and they want to appoint provisional staff. That provisional staff would have to be paid out of funds provided by the State Government because, as I have said, the commission has indicated that it will not be able to make finance available until 1964. I believe from the talks this morning that the commission is prepared to agree that this preliminary expenditure, which it approves now, may be considered for some reimbursement or subsidy later, but

that will be set out in a letter. If the Leader is interested in it (I think it is in his own district), I shall be happy to bring down the file to let him peruse it so that he will be conversant with the details.

**RENT CONTROL.**

Mr. LAUCKE: I was gratified to hear the Premier say last Thursday evening in one of his consistently illuminating television talks that the matter of rents was being examined with a view to removing certain anomalies now extant under the relevant legislation. Concurrently with the investigation into rent control matters, will consideration be given to reviewing the lists of goods and services still under price control with the aim of deleting all items whereon control is no longer deemed necessary or desirable in the public interest?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It all depends upon the definition of the last few words: that is the important part of the honourable member's question. However, the Government is continually examining the items at present under price control. In fact, a recommendation will be made to Executive Council this week eliminating some items at present controlled. Scarcely a week passes now without, from either side of the House, some honourable member's bringing to me a specific case dealing with an overcharge or exorbitant charge in respect of decontrolled items. The Prices Commissioner does an excellent job in dealing with those complaints, but it is significant that today the Government is getting more representations regarding decontrolled items than for the decontrol of items. In those circumstances, the honourable member will realize that, while these items are carefully considered (and an important list will be issued this week of items to be decontrolled), the Government can decontrol them only where it believes that the public interest is involved.

**VICTOR HARBOUR PRIMARY SCHOOL.**

Mr. JENKINS: I asked the Minister two or three weeks ago whether he was aware of the condition of the primary school at Victor Harbour and whether he would take up the matter with a view to having at least the roof painted. Has he a reply?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I regret I have not a considered reply to hand. I know that the Superintendent of Primary Schools and the Property Officer of the Education Department have been investigating the matter but I have not yet received their report. However, I remind the honourable

member, as I would all members, that scores, or even hundreds, of minor works are in the hands of the Director of Education and his officers and the Director of the Public Buildings Department and his officers, and it is not possible, either financially or physically, to do them all as soon as we should like. I will get a specific report on the question and let the honourable member have it as soon as possible.

#### APPRENTICES.

Mr. CUMBE: Last week Sir Richard Kirby, the President of the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission, when discussing the question of the shortage of tradesmen—which is a vital matter in industry today—commented that one of the factors leading to the shortage of tradesmen was the shortage of apprentices in training. He suggested that a conference be held on this topic. Following that, the manufacturing industry, industrialists and the trade union movement agreed to such a conference, which was endorsed by the Commonwealth Minister for Labour, Mr. McMahon. If such a conference is held, will the Premier consult with the Minister of Industry to see that representatives from the Department of Labour and Industry attend the conference so that South Australia will be adequately represented when this important subject is discussed?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes.

#### COUNTRY ABATTOIRS.

Mr. HUGHES: About eight months ago I introduced a deputation to the Minister of Agriculture from the Kadina, Wallaroo and Moonta Districts Development Committee which sought his support for the establishment of a branch of the Metropolitan Abattoirs in part of the power alcohol building at Wallaroo. The deputation suggested that it be large enough to enable killing to be undertaken for the metropolitan area. Can the Minister say whether any decision has been made on the matter and, if so, when the committee can expect a reply?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have not been approached by the Metropolitan Abattoirs Board with a proposal to establish the branch referred to by the honourable member.

#### ABATTOIRS OVERTIME BAN.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I understand that yesterday you, Mr. Speaker, made some efforts at conciliation between the employees and the management of the Gepps Cross abattoirs. Have you anything to report regarding the success or otherwise of your conciliatory efforts?

The SPEAKER: At the written request of representatives of the Meat Industry Employees' Union I approached the Metropolitan Abattoirs Board and asked whether it would be prepared to have a conference with representatives of the union. The conference was arranged. The board readily agreed to hear the employees' case again, which it did. The case was presented by the union Secretary, Mr. Pirie, and the Abattoirs Board replied through its Chairman, Mr. Waterhouse, that the board had reaffirmed its previous decision that the matter must go before the properly constituted tribunal to hear the application for one week's additional sick leave. I should like to point out that I thought it unfortunate that the *Advertiser* report did not contain the full report, which was that the Chairman of the Abattoirs Board drew attention to section 34 of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Act which lays it down as obligatory that any dispute at the abattoirs must be referred to the proper tribunal to hear the case. I recommended to the union representatives that they should refer this question back to a meeting and that they should lift the ban on overtime and make an application to the Wages Board. The union representatives promised to take it back to the men and to let the meeting decide. I understand a meeting is being held today. I am optimistic that the recommendation will be adopted.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the decision to ban overtime at the Metropolitan Abattoirs was decided by a secret ballot of members of the union involved?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I do not know the exact circumstances in which the decision was taken, but I will inquire to see whether I can obtain that information.

#### BOOK SALES.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the possible prosecution of booksellers?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I have been advised by my colleague the Attorney-General as follows:

Considerable investigations have been made with regard to the activities of booksellers in various parts of the State and as a result four prosecutions have been launched against four different booksellers and it is anticipated that these will come on for hearing in the near future and will serve as a warning to other people engaged in this type of business.

## UPPER STURT ROAD.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I believe that on July 1 the Upper Sturt Road between Blackwood and Crafers came under the control of the Highways Department. I understand that certain road improvements are at present being carried out. I have been requested to ascertain the extent of the improvements and, in particular, whether they will extend as far as Footes Hill, which is the hill alongside the National Park golf course. Will the Minister of Works obtain a report from the Minister of Roads on this matter and will he make representations to have work done on Footes Hill if that is not already proposed?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will ask for a report. I point out to the honourable member that within the next day or two the Premier will be Acting Minister of Roads and the member may then be able to have direct negotiations with him.

## NORTHFIELD HOSPITAL.

Mr. LAWN: A week ago yesterday a lady constituent of mine called to see me about her husband who was a patient in the Royal Adelaide Hospital ward at Northfield. He had had two strokes and suffered a lot of illness. He frequently falls over and cannot maintain his balance. From personal experience I know that to be a fact. She was being pressed by the hospital authorities to take her husband away from Northfield and put him into a private hospital. The husband is an invalid pensioner and receives £5 5s. a week. The wife receives £2 7s. 6d. a week as her allowance and 15s. a week for the youngest child. The total income is £8 7s. 6d. a week, yet she was being pressed to transfer her husband to a private hospital. Every time she visited her husband she was asked whether she had made arrangements for her husband's transfer and when she would take him out. I told her that I would write to the Premier, ask for this matter to be investigated and also see whether it would be possible for the husband to remain at Northfield. On September 24 I wrote to the Premier and on September 26 the Premier replied informing me that he was taking the matter up with the Minister of Health. The Premier was good enough to enclose a copy of his reply and I forwarded it to my constituent, following which she again visited the hospital. She saw a doctor—whose name she mentions—and he asked whether she was taking her husband away. She showed him the Premier's reply and did as I instructed her to do, informed the hospital authorities that the matter was being investigated by the Premier

and asked them to wait for the result of that inquiry. This doctor told her that the letter would come to him through the Chief Secretary and he would submit his report to the Chief Secretary. He said that the lady had to take her husband away. Not only that, but this doctor had arranged with a hospital at Parkside for the husband's immediate removal. I do not know whether the lady had to take her husband out, but he was sent out last Saturday to this hospital. I consider it a snub to the Premier and to this House that, whilst the matter was being investigated by the Premier, the hospital authorities totally ignored representations made by members and inquiries made by the Premier and said, "Not only do you have to take your husband out but we have arranged with a hospital to take him." In addition to taking action on the letter I have referred to, will the Premier have this matter investigated to see whether a recurrence of such things as this can be prevented?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes.

## SMITHFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. CLARK: Recently I sought information from the Minister of Education regarding the deterioration of the schoolyard at Smithfield. I understand the Minister has a reply.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The Director of the Public Buildings Department states:

The rubbled surface of the schoolyard at the Smithfield school has deteriorated due to erosion by weather and wear. To overcome the problem, plans, specifications and estimated costs of regrading, draining and bitumen paving the area are being submitted for approval of funds. It is anticipated tenders for this work could be called this month.

## JERVOIS BRIDGE.

Mr. RYAN: Last Wednesday my colleague, the member for Semaphore (Mr. Tapping), asked the Chairman of the Public Works Committee when the committee expected to come to a decision on the Jervois bridge, but the Chairman did not give a conclusive answer. An article in the *Advertiser* of Friday, September 28, under the heading "Port Bridge to have False Kerb", states:

The usable width of the Jervois bridge across the Port River is to be reduced as a safety precaution. The Road Traffic Board yesterday gave the Highways Department permission to install false kerbing which will cut the effective width of the bridge to 26 feet. Provision will be made for cyclists to use a strip on either side outside the kerbing. Load limits are already in force for traffic crossing the bridge so that the structure will hold out until a decision is made on a new crossing.

I understand that as from yesterday the load limit on the bridge has been reduced from 3 tons to 2 tons. In view of the fast deterioration of the bridge and the need for safety, can the Chairman of the committee say when a report is likely to be brought down from the committee on this important project?

Mr. SHANNON (Chairman, Public Works Standing Committee): My committee, of which three of the honourable member's colleagues are members, is well aware of the problem we are facing in this matter and of the steps being taken by the Highways Department to preserve the structure in order that it might at least provide a crossing for people until such time as the bridge is rebuilt. My committee this morning took further evidence from the Highways Department, and we hope now that we will reach a decision on this matter soon. It remains for certain cost assessments to be made and for my committee to decide regarding the alternatives proposed, and it is hoped that we shall be able to do that within the next week or so at the latest. The Commissioner of Highways (Mr. Jackman) this morning said that it would not take long to prepare his statement of costs. I must inform honourable members that after the committee has made its report there will be an unavoidable time lag, because plans and specifications and bills of quantities have to be prepared and tenders called for the work, and this will take about 12 months. Following the acceptance of the successful tender construction will take between 18 months and two years. People who are concerned about this crossing should be patient with the Highways Department; it will mean that they will have to be content with the present reduced loading limit for the next three years at least, in my view. Since the committee has already recommended an alternative crossing between Bower Road and the Old Port Road, and the linking of the Old Port Road through Church Street and Nelson Street with the Birkenhead bridge, the committee considers that the inconvenience that will be caused to people trading in Port Adelaide will be at a minimum. I do not think the honourable member will have to wait more than a week or two for a report on the Jervois bridge project.

#### UNIVERSITY FEES.

Mr. HUTCHENS: As the University of Adelaide has announced that it proposes to increase its fees, much concern is felt by many wage and salary earners regarding the future of their children. Conflicting statements have

been made on this matter. Can the Minister of Education say what percentage of relief the proposed additional fees will give to university administration costs; whether the purpose of the proposed increased fees is to restrict the inflow of students into the university; and whether the proposal to increase fees will prejudice the aim of the State's expenditure on education? Can the Minister also give an assurance that, following the increase of fees, the sons and daughters of wage and salary earners will not be denied the use of the university, much of the capital cost of which was provided by Government?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I am not able at present to give the honourable member full and detailed replies to his questions. I point out that the Council of the University of Adelaide is an autonomous or at least a semi-autonomous body. I shall endeavour to obtain the information from the council. I shall also discuss the matter with the Premier, who, as Treasurer, is very much concerned with this matter, and as soon as possible I shall let the honourable member have what information it is within my power to give him.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Has the Premier details that may relieve some of the present anxiety about the proposed increased fees?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If I may digress for a few moments, I point out that it is necessary for the University Council to charge about the same fees for the University of Adelaide as apply at other universities, because that is part of the council's revenue and is an item considered in the matching grant received from the Commonwealth Government, so it is important that the fees at the university be kept at about the same level as those of other universities. Actually, the fees at the University of Adelaide (and I commend the council for it) have always been, and I think still are, below the level of those at universities in other States. Most of the fees paid today by students at the university are, of course, reimbursed by Commonwealth scholarships, which automatically increase in value if the fees are increased. But, to meet cases of hardship, if the honourable member will look at this year's Estimates for the Education Department, under the heading "Miscellaneous" he will see there is voted an amount of £20,000, which will be made available to the University Council to deal particularly with any case of hardship where no reimbursement through

scholarship is made or where the student is, for some reason or another, at a financial disadvantage. That £20,000 has already been approved by this House and will be made available to the University Council. I have no doubt that it will be applied as I have indicated to the honourable member.

#### OIL INSTALLATION.

Mr. TAPPING: Over the weekend I noticed that the Liberian tanker *Scherzo* was discharging oil at No. 4 berth, Outer Harbour, into the pipeline going to Pelican Point and into an installation recently placed there by Amoco Aust. Pty. Ltd. I read in the daily press that this was done by arrangement between the Harbors Board and Amoco. I also read in a newspaper published in another State that this was a temporary arrangement and that it would be used only until a permanent installation had been constructed. Can the Minister of Marine give details of the arrangement between the board and the company and say whether it is temporary?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I cannot from memory give a detailed reply on precisely what arrangements have been made between the Harbors Board and the company concerned, and I do not think it would be proper for me to disclose matters that are entirely confidential between the two parties. With that proviso, however, I can say that the company desired a site upon which to establish depot facilities, and the Harbors Board, under the Greater Port Adelaide Plan, set aside a substantial area on Pelican Point for future oil terminals. There is always objection to having an oil terminal, particularly where white spirit is involved, and where handling and discharge from tanker to shore and *vice versa* occur in enclosed waters such as the Port River. It has always been the desire of the Harbors Board to get away from that problem because, as the honourable member realizes, a mishap during the handling of explosive spirits in the Port River area could endanger the wharf structure for a great distance along the river frontage and also be a hazard to shipping and other activities in the area. Therefore, when a new company sought a site, the Harbors Board naturally allocated it a site at Pelican Point, which it accepted. I think the company plans to have in the future a wharf structure opposite the new site at Pelican Point, but, until development justifies that it has asked for some temporary facility to be granted. That facility is the pipeline to which the honourable member referred. This terminates on No. 4 berth, and it is being used

for the purpose of discharging oil by this company. I am not able to add to that; I think that answers the question as far as I can take it at the moment.

#### POST-MORTEM EXAMINATIONS.

Mr. RICHES: Has the Minister of Education a reply to a question I asked last week about the refusal of doctors to perform post-mortem examinations in the country?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The Attorney-General reports:

For some time difficulty has been experienced in getting certain country doctors to perform post-mortems and, as the honourable member said, the five doctors at Port Augusta have refused to perform post-mortems. This has meant that either a pathologist has to be sent to Port Augusta to perform the post-mortem or the body must be conveyed to a place where a doctor is prepared to undertake the work. In recent weeks, the Attorney-General has been endeavouring to arrange for a panel of medical men in country areas to do post-mortems and, at the present time, doctors in 60 country towns have indicated that they will undertake this work. If the local doctor feels it necessary, arrangements will be made for him to receive advice and assistance from a competent pathologist in the city. We are fully aware of the difficulties to which the honourable member refers and are doing everything possible to provide the satisfactory solution.

#### NANGWARRY HOUSING.

Mr. HARDING: In the current issue of the *Border Watch* the following statement about the Penola District Council rating appeared:

Nangwarry is a Government township, and homes can only be subject to rates if occupied. A large number of homes at Nangwarry are not occupied at present, and therefore rate revenue will drop during the current year.

As I doubt the correctness of this, will the Minister of Forests check on the number of houses vacant there and inform me later?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes.

#### ORIENTAL FRUIT MOTH BILL.

Mr. CURREN: As the oriental fruit moth is causing much concern in the Renmark district, and passage of legislation to deal with it is considered to be urgent, will the Premier give urgent priority to the Oriental Fruit Moth Bill?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I shall be pleased to move this item closer to the top of the Notice Paper. I am not sure I can promise that it will be the next Bill dealt with after the Bill the House is discussing is disposed of, but I hope to have early consideration given to it.

## ADELAIDE OVAL.

Mr. LANGLEY: The queues for entrance to sporting events are now increasing in size. I have received complaints, after last Saturday's game at Adelaide Oval, of discourteous conduct. Several young people were pushed and knocked down. If this conduct continues, injuries may be serious. Will the Premier consult the Chief Secretary to ensure that these queues are kept orderly by the Police Department, especially near the entrance gates?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will bring the honourable member's question to the notice of my colleague, who, I have no doubt, will take the appropriate action.

## LEAVING HONOURS CLASSES.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Last week I asked a question of the Minister of Education about Leaving Honours classes in the country. In his reply he said that the matter was associated with a very protracted inquiry by the committee appointed by the University of Adelaide dealing with fifth-year classes. Even if the committee appointed by the university decides to embark upon five-year matriculation courses, is it not a fact that the Education Department will not be able to put these into operation until 1965? If that is so, will it not be the position, unless Leaving Honours classes are granted in the country soon, that the country areas will be without Leaving Honours classes during 1963 and 1964 and, as already students in the country are being placed at a disadvantage when applying for employment in places such as Whyalla, where Leaving Honours students are not available and, consequently, Leaving Honours students from elsewhere are receiving preference for employment in certain work, will the Minister get an explanation on this point with a view to seeing whether we cannot have Leaving Honours classes assured for 1963 and 1964?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I have not received any final report from the university but, from information received from the Director of Education recently, it would appear unlikely that the fifth-year classes could be established in country high schools before 1965 at the earliest. In view of that, Cabinet has considered the matter of Leaving Honours urgently up to and including yesterday and, as a result of discussions, I hope to be able to make an announcement soon.

## DESERTED WIVES.

Mr. LAUCKE: I was impressed by an article written by Helen Caterer in the *Sunday Mail* about the need for more adequate protection for deserted wives left to fend

for their children. From time to time I have had referred to me some disturbing instances of irresponsible and unprincipled avoidance by husbands of liability to provide maintenance money for deserted wives. Will the Premier consider appointing special officers to the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department with the specific duty of tracing deserting husbands and giving those officers such powers as may be necessary to ensure that the deserting husband meets his monetary obligation to his family?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will take up that matter with my colleague. I do not believe that at present the problem is one of shortage of staff. There are a number of associated problems. Some deserting husbands desert not only their wives but their State. I know that the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department is concerned about the number of places where it cannot make any suitable financial adjustment and it makes much money available to try to support people placed in these circumstances. If it is a question of staff, I assure the honourable member that that can easily, and will, be put right, but I understand that staff is not the trouble.

## WHEAT CROP COMPETITIONS.

Mr. NANKIVELL: On Sunday evening in the Australian Broadcasting Commission's news a statement was attributed to Mr. E. D. Buckley of Bordertown relating to the cessation of State wheat crop competitions. This was followed yesterday morning by a small newspaper column written by Mr. Retalic of the Australian Primary Producers Union on this subject. It was implied that the cessation of State wheat crop competitions would affect the introduction and adoption of new and better varieties of wheat; it would also be reflected in the overall standard of workmanship and the quality of the crop, particularly if a lack of interest developed in the growing of true type varieties. Would the Minister of Agriculture care to comment on that or, if not, will he obtain a report from the department upon the practicability or otherwise of reinstating the State wheat crop competitions?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will get a considered reply for the honourable member as soon as possible.

## ABATTOIRS WORKERS' LEAVE.

Mr. Loveday for Mr. LAWN (on notice):  
1. How many persons (other than clerical staff) have been employed at the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs during the past two years?

2. How many days' work was lost for which workmen's compensation was paid?

3. How many employees used all their paid sick leave as distinct from leave for which workmen's compensation was paid?

4. How many days' work was lost as a result of sickness additional to paid sick leave and leave for which workmen's compensation was paid?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The General Manager of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board reports:

1. During the period January 1, 1961, to December 31, 1961, the board employed 1,203 union employees, inclusive of those persons who ceased to be employed for various reasons during that period and their replacements. On January 1, 1961, the union payroll numbered 1,037 employees and on December 31, 1961, the number was 1,022.

2. For the period January 1, 1961, to December 31, 1961, of the 1,203 union personnel employed the number of days lost for which workmen's compensation was paid totalled 3,166 represented by 503 individual claims.

3. It is presumed that this question relates to all employees who used their annual entitlement of five days' paid sick leave. If so, there were during the period January 1, 1961, to December 31, 1961, 424 union employees out of the 1,203 persons employed by the board who took five days' paid sick leave or more. This figure includes a proportion who were paid sick leave for personal injury not sustained on the job or other illnesses which could not be related to their work. The remaining 779 employees took less than five days' paid sick leave.

4. During the period January 1, 1961, to December 31, 1961, a total of 5,924 unpaid sick days were lost by 659 men out of 1,203 employed. Of this number of days 3,054 represented absences by 44 employees, the reasons for which could not be associated with their work. Taking the 3,504 days into account the balance of 2,870 days was spread over the remaining 615 employees (659 less 44) of which number 166 had taken one day or less of unpaid leave leaving a balance of 449 persons who took unpaid sick leave in excess of one day and upwards.

In addition to absences on account of paid sick leave, unpaid sick leave and workmen's compensation leave, there was some absenteeism on the job on account of approved leave without pay (other than sick leave) and leave of absence without a reason, both of which affect annual and long service leave entitlements. It is to be noted that an employee is allowed three calendar months' unpaid sick leave before annual leave is affected and this could have some influence on the type of unpaid leave applied for. No medical certificate is furnished for any unpaid sick leave.

#### PETROL STATIONS.

Mr. DUNSTAN (on notice):

1. In view of the fact that many demolitions of dwellings are taking place to provide for

the erection of petrol stations in areas already well served with petrol stations, what agreement exists between the Government and the oil wholesalers about erection of petrol stations in the metropolitan area?

2. If there is no such agreement, is it the intention of the Government to take action to obtain one?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The replies are:

1. No agreement exists.

2. Such powers as exist are, at present, vested in local government, which is authorized to exercise them.

#### POLICE INQUIRY.

Mr. FRED WALSH (on notice): Is it the intention of the Government to appoint a Royal Commission to investigate the administration of the South Australian Police Force, in view of the fact that the Commissioner and Inspector N. Lenton have invited the appointment of an independent tribunal of inquiry?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Since the honourable member placed question No. 3 upon the Notice Paper, I have carefully considered the allegations to which the question refers. I have not found in the time at my disposal that any matter of importance raised is based upon other than second-hand or third-hand information. Governments do not appoint a Royal Commission except where they have before them the necessary evidence of fact supported by responsible citizens who make, or are prepared to make, upon affidavit if required, allegations of malpractice which affect the well-being of the State. If honourable members have any such evidence the Government will give careful consideration to it.

#### ELIZABETH FACTORIES.

Mr. FRED WALSH (on notice):

1. How many factory buildings at Elizabeth are owned by the South Australian Housing Trust?

2. Who rents these factories?

3. What are the respective rents?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Ten factories have been established. Details will be supplied to the honourable member and to any other honourable member interested, but it is not considered advisable to make the information available to the general public.

## PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORT.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Radio and Electrical Trade Schools, Challa Gardens.

Ordered that report be printed.

METROPOLITAN AND EXPORT  
ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 27. Page 1162.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Miteham): I support the principle of this Bill. As a Liberal I believe in the general rule of competition in business, and circumstances have to be exceptional for that rule to be broken. I acknowledge that circumstances frequently are exceptional and that monopoly by a public company, and sometimes a private company, is justified, but circumstances also change and what may be justifiable at one point of time might not be justifiable at another. I am not concerned with the past, but today there can be no doubt that the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs at Gepps Cross really has a complete monopoly within its own area. Incidentally, during this debate we have heard much about decentralization. I think the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) referred to the special committee which is investigating decentralization of industry. The member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) and I have the honour of being members of that committee. All the evidence that we have heard on the question of the establishment of abattoirs—and this is how I interpret that evidence—is that no matter where an abattoir is established, for it to have any chance of success it must have access to the metropolitan area. No abattoirs can survive merely on export killings. To the extent that this Bill contemplates sales within the metropolitan area it encourages decentralization rather than the reverse.

Mr. Casey: The Peterborough meatworks is not in opposition: it kills for export.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member has already made his speech and I cannot remember whether he covered that question or not.

Mr. Jennings: It was a good speech.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It was an excellent speech, and perhaps I will say something about it presently, if the honourable member wants me to.

Mr. Riches: What about answering the previous interjection!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I will leave that to the member for Stuart. If he cares to put a different gloss on the evidence that we have taken, I shall be happy to hear it. I have stated how I have interpreted that evidence. The abattoirs at Gepps Cross is a prime example of a State monopoly which, as such, is no longer serving the best interests of the community. Because the community has so much capital tied up in it—estimated at about £2,000,000 at cost—there is much hesitation and heartburn about interfering with the monopoly for the fear of reducing the value of that invested capital, even though interference is abundantly justified in other ways. The present position and the debate on this Bill indicate that this is an excellent practical illustration of one of the great weaknesses of Socialism—its resistance to change and its incapacity to adapt itself to the times. I do not—as the member for Frome (Mr. Casey) did in his speech, be it excellent or otherwise—blame the board for what has happened. The recipe given by the member for Frome for solving the present problem apparently is to shake up the board of management to make it more efficient. I do not believe that that is the answer. I have heard the Chairman of the board (Mr. David Waterhouse) explain the difficulties which the Act itself imposes on the board. Mr. Waterhouse has stated that the board is there to carry out its duties and to administer the legislation passed by Parliament, whatever its provisions may contain.

Mr. Casey: You have got the wrong slant on what I said about the board.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not think I have. I waded through the honourable member's speech over the weekend—

Mr. Casey: I said the board could reduce costs.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. "Shake it up and make it more efficient" is only a paraphrase of that, and that is precisely what I said. The member for Frome is on one side of the House and I am on the other; he has his views, erroneous though I consider them to be in this case, and I have mine. I do not propose either to go into the pros and cons of the present industrial trouble at Gepps Cross, for that has already been done admirably by a number of members on this side of the House, notably by the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke), with whose views I wholeheartedly agree. It was obvious that what he said was not liked by the Opposition. Since then the members for Frome, Port Adelaide and Port Pirie have

spoken, but not one of them has questioned or denied the accuracy of the matters put before this House by the member for Burra.

I do desire to say something very briefly about the actual provisions of the Bill. I support the Bill as it stands and will oppose the amendments to be moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I wonder whether the Bill achieves its object. The scheme of the Bill, as we are all aware, is to allow the Minister of Agriculture to grant licences for the establishment of abattoirs anywhere in the State and for the sale of meat within the metropolitan abattoirs area. So far so good; I agree with that scheme. What I wonder is whether the Bill, as drawn, gives any individual organization sufficient security to sink a large sum of money into the establishment and running of an abattoirs. I very much doubt whether it does. The capital investment in an abattoirs would run into hundreds of thousands of pounds, if not more. I think the figures for the investment in the Gepps Cross abattoirs show that, for there it runs into millions of pounds. For how long will a licensee be allowed to continue to operate? We have already heard what the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) would do in this matter. The honourable member said:

If I am a back-bencher sitting on the Government side after the next elections—I notice he had the humility not to assume that he would be on the front bench—the licences will be withdrawn, and they can do what they like with their building: they can demolish it or leave it idle with the capital investment in it.

I do not know whether that is the official expression of view by the members of the Opposition, but that is one expression—one threat—of what would happen if the Labor Party were to form a Government at some future time. Sir, I also ask what would happen to this legislation and to any licensees who may have established under it if something were to happen to the Minister or, worse still—and I say that with very great respect to the Minister—if something were to happen to the present Government, which I am sure all members in this House would agree would be a calamity of the first order. What would happen if we had another Minister of Agriculture or another Government of a different political persuasion and with different views? It would not be very difficult at all under the provisions of this Bill for a licensee to be entirely jeopardized. I refer particularly to proposed new section 70a (5), which reads:

If a person to whom a licence is granted under this section contravenes or fails to observe any condition of the licence he shall be guilty of an offence.

In a big undertaking it is easy, even through sheer inadvertence, to commit an offence and therefore to fall within the purview of that particular subsection. And that subsection, of course, provides a penalty of £100. The next one, proposed new subsection (6), is the one with the sting in its tail. It reads:

If a person is convicted of an offence under subsection (5) of this section the Minister may revoke the licence granted to such person.

Mr. Coumbe: "May".

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is so. The point I am making is that if there were an unsympathetic Minister it would be very easy indeed under this legislation for a licence to be revoked.

Mr. Clark: Don't you think it is a necessary precaution?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think it is a necessary precaution to have something like this, but I cannot forget the ringing words of the member for Adelaide and the whole attitude of members opposite in debating this matter; it is pretty obvious what they think. The query I am raising is whether the present legislation gives sufficient security and encouragement to an organization to apply for a licence. I know that any piece of legislation can be altered later, but I do think the present Bill gives tremendous power to one Minister—to one man. I certainly do not intend to suggest any amendments myself, but I think it would be a good idea to have a look at this legislation as time goes on and perhaps to set out in more detail the rights and duties of licensees, the circumstances in which licences can be granted, for how long they will be granted, and the circumstances in which they can be revoked. Mr. Speaker, I believe that such provisions would be a greater encouragement to private enterprise to invest the large sum necessary to establish an abattoirs. I support the second reading.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): Mr. Speaker, I oppose the Bill. I understand a vote is likely to be taken on the matter this afternoon, and most that needed to be said has already been said. I oppose the Bill for several reasons, the first being that the aim of the Bill is something with which I disagree. I cannot escape the conclusion (nor can my colleagues on this side of the House) that the principal purpose of this Bill is to intimidate the union concerned and the workers employed in this industry, and

that the union and the workers should be emasculated by this Bill. This intention is an inevitable forerunner of the second intention in the Bill, and that is the letting into the killing industry and the meat industry generally not of private enterprise, as we know it on this side of the House, but monopoly enterprise, typified in Australia in this industry by the gigantic Vestey-Angliss set-up. I firmly believe that this legislation is intended to allow these monopolistic organizations to get firmly established in South Australia to their own profit and to the eventual detriment of everyone else associated with the meat industry, including the people whom members on the other side of the House presume to represent—the primary producers. As members on both sides of the House know, these monopolies have almost a stranglehold on the meat industry throughout Australia—and they pay well for services given them, too. I cannot see that Mr. Menzies, for example, was given £20 a week for life in the will of Sir William Angliss out of the goodness of heart of Sir William.

Mr. Millhouse: Why not?

Mr. JENNINGS. Because a man who amassed £4,000,000 in his lifetime by exploiting the work of others would not, I think, be likely to give £20 a week to Mr. Menzies if it were not for some services rendered.

Mr. Millhouse: Have you any idea what they were?

Mr. JENNINGS: No, but Mr. Menzies and some of his colleagues may know; indeed, perhaps Sir William Angliss knows, but we have no way of getting it from him. The next reason for my opposition to the Bill—and I assure members that it is an important reason from my point of view—is that the abattoirs is situated in my district and the great majority of its employees live in my district. I deeply deprecate and highly resent some of the intemperate reflections that have been made on them during this debate by members opposite. Naturally, I know many of these workers personally; many of them live around the Pooraka area.

Mr. Clark: And the rest come from High-bury.

Mr. JENNINGS: No doubt many of them come from the Gawler area. Instead of their being moral cowards, as they have been described in this House, there is not a more respectable body or a more disinterested and self-sacrificing section of the community in this State.

*Members interjecting.*

Mr. JENNINGS: These people are second to none in this State for charitable work and other community efforts.

Mr. Shannon: Charity begins at home.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. JENNINGS: This reflection of their being moral cowards is one of the worst forms of expression I have ever heard in this House to describe people outside who have no chance of answering back. I may have heard worse things said across the floor of the House or by a member on one side to another member on the same side, but that is a different matter. It is peculiar that these references are made about a union which is not irresponsible and which is led by a man whom I think I could describe as one of the most moderate union men in Australia.

Mr. Clark: And he is a highly respected man.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, he is highly respected, as proved by the fact that he has not been opposed for his position in the whole time he has occupied it and, generally speaking, I think he has the respect of the management of the abattoirs. At least, the management must have had some fairly high regard for him before he got his present position because he was then occupying rather a senior position in employment at the abattoirs. The union has always conducted itself in a most responsible fashion, and I believe that on this occasion it is conducting itself with remarkable restraint instead of being irresponsible and trivial on this overtime ban.

Some members have said that an action of this nature should not have been taken in a season like the present season, when lambs are coming in for slaughter. Let us all be reasonable about it; from a bargaining point of view, what in the world would be the use of some industrial action banning overtime when no overtime was being worked? I think that, rather than blame the union for applying an overtime ban at this stage, we should perhaps commend it for its restraint in not having a general strike.

Mr. Shannon: They tried that before you were a member of Parliament. I had to bring down meat for you people to eat.

Mr. JENNINGS: I thought the honourable member said he had something to do with a committee of inquiry, and I was going to say it was no wonder we were in such a mess.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. JENNINGS: I believe members opposite would be better advised to get their supporters in the country, who no doubt are suffering from this unfortunate position (I do not doubt

that for a moment), to bring some pressure on the Abattoirs Board for it to try to arrive at some amicable agreement. I believe the justice of the case is absolutely incontrovertible.

Mr. Shannon: That was decided in April of this year, when the last determination was made.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. JENNINGS: We know that some people employed at the abattoirs receive three weeks' sick pay a year and that others receive two weeks, yet these people have only the vaguest contact with slaughtering. However, the men who do the slaughtering and who are most closely associated with health hazards get only one week's sick leave a year. I therefore ask members to vote against this Bill. Let the Minister of Agriculture disabuse his mind that this legislation will overcome the present difficulties. On the contrary, it will only provoke increased hostilities at the Gepps Cross abattoirs and at other abattoirs that may be established as a result of its passing.

Mr. JENKINS (Stirling): I support this Bill, which is designed to give the Minister authority to issue a licence wherever he considers a person is qualified to hold it. I think the time has come for legislation of this nature because this State's sheep population, which was about 11,000,000 in 1958 or 1959, is now about 16,500,000. Another thing that indicates the need for this legislation is that our population is increasing each year by about 2½ per cent. It may be wise to spread the activity of an abattoirs into some other locality. At the outset I wish to indicate that I do not object to the men at the abattoirs getting another week's sick leave a year if the conditions of their work warrant it. However, I should like to see them go about it in the right way, the constitutional way of applying to the wages board, or whatever the authority is that they should approach. I do not believe that has been done. The time they have chosen for the ban on overtime is definitely chosen to put the producers at a great disability and bring pressure to bear tantamount to blackmail. This has been an adverse season for primary producers, with dry conditions prevailing, and, apart from the fat lamb production, which needs to be treated when it reaches the bloom or peak, there are the sheep that the farmer wants to send to the abattoirs to get rid of in the required numbers. The farmers would like to get rid of certain sheep at this stage to be able to carry on their operations in the coming year.

I think the Opposition is considerably confused over this issue. Some members opposite have said that this is strike-breaking legislation; others have said it is not but that it is introduced just because of an overtime ban. Members opposite were struggling to justify their opposition to this Bill. Never once during the debate have I heard them mention the disability to which the producers are being put. The weekend press revealed the numbers of sheep that could not be sent to the abattoirs because of this ban. Kangaroo Island is in dire straits, many districts being barred from sending sheep by road or rail to the abattoirs for treatment. If the normal overtime work were proceeding there, these sheep would be dealt with instead of being held at great disadvantage to the producers or sent to another State for disposal of there.

The member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens), when answering one or two honourable members, said that the Bill was designed to give a licence to William Angliss & Co. (Aus.) Pty. Ltd. to set up an abattoirs in the metropolitan area. There is nothing like that specified in the Bill, which states:

... the Minister . . . may grant a licence for such period as he shall think fit to any person to slaughter, elsewhere than at the abattoirs of the board, any stock for sale for human consumption.

I am not a bit concerned whether another abattoirs is set up in the metropolitan area or in the country. It would be another outlet for the stock of producers. I do not know whether the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) was right when he said that if more abattoirs were set up the same conditions would prevail and the producers would be at a disadvantage because the unions concerned with those works would be hostile to the establishment of a further abattoirs. I do not care whether it is William Angliss & Co. or anybody else who sets up but, if William Angliss & Co. has been looking at this for some two or three years, if it is qualified and able to carry on the business, I cannot see that it would do much harm.

The member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan) said that the Government was not prepared to assist industries or abattoirs in the country areas, and he mentioned Naracoorte where I believe negotiations have been taking place between a certain party and the Government to set up an abattoirs there. I understand that the Government nearly turned over backwards trying to assist the establishment of an abattoirs there. It promised water, drainage,

electricity, housing and a certain amount of financial aid. Obviously the member for Port Adelaide was not aware of the fact that Mr. Popp, the person concerned, was already established in a small way at Peterborough.

In relation to the proposed abattoirs at Penola, I should like to quote from *Hansard* a question asked by the member for Frome (Mr. Casey) on September 20. It is as follows:

In view of the increased numbers of sheep and lambs in this State and the likelihood of further increases in future years, does the Government intend to proceed itself, or to assist other organizations, with the establishment of meat-works in country areas? I understand that the Industries Development Committee has been asked to collate evidence on this matter over the past two years. Can the Premier say when a report from the committee is likely to be available?

The Premier's reply was:

The answer to the second question is "No". The answer to the first question is that the Government has made a public offer available for the last four years to any authority beyond 80 miles from the General Post Office to assist it financially to establish an abattoirs, to provide the public utilities necessary for the establishment of an abattoirs and to give it a franchise to bring a percentage of its meat into the metropolitan area, but no proposition has been submitted to us in that respect. I repeat that the Government is prepared to make substantial financial contributions towards the establishment of a country abattoirs, to provide houses for employees, to see that electricity, water and sanitary arrangements are available, and to give a franchise for the importation into the metropolitan area of 50 per cent of the total killings on a weight basis, provided it does not exceed one-seventh of the metropolitan area's total consumption.

Nothing could be fairer than that in the way of Government assistance to anybody wishing to establish a country killing works. I understand that at Penola the Government offered, apart from these things, to provide 75 per cent of the cost of the establishment if the people there deciding to set it up would find the remaining 25 per cent. I do not think it is fair that the Government should be accused of not trying to assist a country killing works. There are small killing works in different parts of the country. At Strathalbyn, the Roberts brothers started up in a small way after returning from the Second World War. Today they employ 19 men in their killing works in both a wholesale and retail butchering business. One of the problems associated with their business is that under the Abattoirs Act they have to bring their meat into the city to an inspection centre in

Gilles Street. They have to bring it in warm with the head, liver and lungs attached. That entails considerable expense for these people and, if they could get a licence, if they desired that the inspection of their meat should be made on the premises where it was killed, it would reduce their costs.

Another cost involved is the carriage of stock from the South-East. The member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) asked a question last week on behalf of producers in his area, in which he said that they were at a disadvantage in getting their stock by rail to Strathalbyn. I took up the same matter a fortnight ago with the Transport Control Board but was unsuccessful in getting terms for them to get a truck to pick up their stock. They cannot purchase their own semi-trailers but I am hoping that something will be afforded them to make it more economic for them in the future. I think that the establishment of another abattoirs would be in the interests of the producers. It would be another place to which they could send their stock and it would spread some of the activity further over the State. If there could be ways of establishing killing works in the country I should be pleased, and this Bill provides for licences to be granted to anywhere. I support the Bill.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): I oppose the Bill. It is particularly interesting to examine some speeches of Government members to see what is in their minds. Obviously some welcome this legislation as a means of getting what they call a private enterprise abattoirs established to provide competition for the existing abattoirs. In introducing the Bill the Minister said that the policy of the Government was to create conditions whereby the interests of all sections of the community were properly preserved and that it was felt that these interests would be furthered by permission being granted for the establishment of more slaughtering facilities. The previous speaker said that he could find nothing in the Bill which would confine the licences to the metropolitan area, and that is so, but I think it is obvious, from what is known of the general situation, that the intention is to assist someone to establish an abattoirs in the metropolitan area. The President of the South Australian National Farmers Union (Mr. McAuley) made no bones about it: he said that what was wanted was another metropolitan abattoirs to challenge the virtual Government monopoly at Gepps Cross. Members of the Opposition have no illusions about the real purpose of the Bill.

Our policy, for a long time, has been for the establishment of other abattoirs in the country, and we would like to see them associated with the Metropolitan Abattoirs so that meat could be provided for the public and for export under the best possible conditions and on the best possible terms.

Let us examine whether, in fact, another metropolitan abattoirs would preserve the interests of all the people of the State, and particularly of primary producers who are so concerned about this particular issue. I have taken time to examine the annual reports of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board since 1943. Some interesting remarks appear therein. An investigation in 1945 revealed that the works were used to the best advantage. Subsequent inquiries revealed a similar situation. Of course, some recommendations were made about the workings of the abattoirs, but it was never suggested that the abattoirs was not worked efficiently or to the best advantage of all concerned. The records show many surpluses as well as many substantial deficits, but the deficits undoubtedly outweigh the surpluses. It is obvious from these annual reports that this has been due primarily to two factors—the tremendous fluctuation in and the clearing of stock coming forward, owing to the variation in seasons, and the losses incurred through the work on export slaughtering.

It is interesting to note just how much the taxpayer, through the Government, has been assisting the primary producer on the export side. In 1951 the deficit totalled £49,160. This was a small export season. A big proportion of the losses incurred was due to the fixed charges for interest and so on which were directly incurred to provide facilities for treating export stock. In 1954 there were fewer stock for export and the deficit was £97,292. This, in large measure, was due to the cost of overtime for slaughtering stock for export. Another reason for the deficit was the cost of training and retaining slaughtermen in readiness to treat export lambs which did not come forward in appreciable numbers until the end of September, 1953. In 1956 the deficit was £6,864, partly due to the continuance of price control on fertilizer and stock foods. In other words the primary producers were getting fertilizer and stock foods at a price that was detrimental to the abattoirs. Primary producers were being assisted by the continued price control on these products.

In 1959 the deficit of £126,740 was due to the increased cost of treating large quantities of

stock for the North American market, particularly the boning and packing operations. In other words, once again the primary producer was being helped, at the expense of the community, through this abattoirs, about which we have heard so much concerning its alleged inefficiency. It has been suggested that there should be a private abattoirs in the metropolitan area to compete with it and, as the member for Mitcham said, to shake it up. In 1960 the deficit was £70,941, and this was partly due to the fact that the wages for slaughtering stock passed for export were not varied whereas the local trade slaughtering wage was increased by a halfpenny a pound.

These facts indicate clearly that the primary producer has been receiving substantial help from the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs. Would any member opposite claim that if a private enterprise abattoirs were established he would receive that type of help from that private enterprise? I suggest that what would happen if a private enterprise abattoirs were established would be that that abattoirs would select the cream of the business. It would be in a totally different situation from the existing abattoirs which is a service abattoirs and cannot buy and sell stock. The private enterprise abattoirs would buy and sell stock, because that is what it would want to do, and it would be in an advantageous position compared with the Metropolitan Abattoirs. As a result we would have an overcapitalized industry to deal with the slaughtering of stock, and the Metropolitan Abattoirs, in which about £2,000,000 of public money is invested, would be at a complete disadvantage.

This Bill is said to be in the interests of all sections of the community. Obviously it is not. The community as a whole will be placed at a tremendous disadvantage. That is the long-term view, now let us examine the short-term view. Nowhere in the Minister's speech have I seen explained how this Bill will meet the short-term position. It is most interesting to note that in the weekend press the Chairman of the Operational Committee of the Meat Board of South Australia (Mr. Dunsford) expects to see the sheep cleared on October 10. How can this Bill deal with the short-term effects of what is happening?

Mr. Heaslip: They should not have been there that long.

Mr. LOVEDAY: That has nothing to do with it. This Bill cannot deal with the short-term problems and, if it is to deal with the long-term problems, it can only be to the disadvantage of the whole community including

primary producers, because the present abattoirs will be placed at a grave competitive disadvantage. If it continues to kill stock for export, higher charges will have to be imposed and, on the evidence from the annual reports, the abattoirs will have to be subsidized. Nobody can claim, on the results of the investigations, that the abattoirs has not been run reasonably efficiently.

Mr. Shannon: Except your own people who say that killing costs are too high.

Mr. LOVEDAY: The member for Onkapinga (Mr. Shannon) was not present when I outlined why the deficits exceeded the surpluses, but if he cares to read my speech he will become aware of the facts given in the annual reports. This Bill does not adequately deal with the short-term position or with the long-term position; in other words, the Bill should be defeated in the interests of the community apart from any other considerations. It is of interest, too, that we have not heard a satisfactory explanation for the extra killing capacity at the abattoirs not being used. We have had some excuses that are not proper explanations and, what is more, I doubt whether the Abattoirs Board really wants to work overtime on the killing of stock for export based on its past experiences. The annual reports clearly show that that is the losing side of the abattoirs' operations. That being so, would the board have any incentive to work overtime on export stock?

Too much heat over the men's action has been engendered in this debate, but it is interesting that the press, which usually never lets up on employees involved in industrial disputes, has had little to say against these employees. All the heat and insults in this matter have come from the floor of this House and through the words of Mr. McAuley, who, according to yesterday's *News*, made some statements on the position at the abattoirs that are not borne out by other people. His comments are obviously exaggerations of the worst kind. For example, the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals inspectors pointed out that his statement was quite wrong. He made it clear that he was only interested in having another metropolitan abattoirs established. The member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) made it clear that he was only concerned with "seeing it never happens again". If anybody imagines that this type of legislation can prevent industrial trouble, they do not know much about industrial affairs, because, if men in any place are subject to what they consider to be injustices and cannot find a satisfactory way

of remedying them, they will find some other method of eventually getting over those injustices, and it is only a question of time and the extent of the injustice that determines the action they take.

The member for Burra (Mr. Quirke), if I remember rightly, said that if this Bill became law the men would never again work overtime. He said that this legislation would achieve two objects: it would take away from these men what they called their harvest of the year—he had no compunction about that at all—and he thought it would prevent industrial trouble in future. These two arguments, particularly the one about preventing industrial trouble in future, have no basis because if men in industry suffer enough injustice from one angle, irrespective of whether they work overtime, they will find some way of dealing with that injustice. I agree with other speakers on this side who have stated that the establishment of another abattoirs would certainly not prevent a recurrence of industrial trouble. Therefore, this Bill will not achieve what its sponsors claim. It will not obviate future industrial trouble and will not cope with either the short-term or the long-term problems, but will result in disadvantages to everybody concerned.

An important point that has not been emphasized in this House is that this is a service abattoirs that cannot buy and sell stock. It slaughters stock bought and sold by other people. A private abattoirs will be able to buy and sell stock and take the cream of the work, leaving the present abattoirs with the leftovers. What will that solve? It is remarkable that not one member opposite brought that point out. Most of them have been only too anxious to slate the employees involved in this disturbance. No-one actually knows, from what has been said here, what has taken place between the two parties involved. No-one knows what words have been uttered. The only solution to the problem is the course now being adopted—getting the parties together in an effort to reach a solution. Obviously, the facts presented here show that these men deserve another week's sick leave.

Mr. Shannon: We know that this was the result of an agreement between the parties in April of this year.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Whyalla.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I shall not reiterate what was said by other speakers, but my opposition to the Bill rests primarily on the fact that it will not achieve what its sponsors claim, and

therefore it will fail. I have made it clear that it will fail and I challenge any Government member to show how this legislation can succeed and do what he claims. I am sure this is not the proper approach if harmony is to be achieved in the industry. It will only result in bitter feelings giving rise to further industrial trouble in the future. This is the old approach that we have heard over the years of always condemning the employee and getting stuck into him to show him how wrong and irresponsible he is. How irresponsible are some of the other people involved in this trouble? How do we know? Further, I believe this Bill shows complete irresponsibility on the part of the Government regarding the future of slaughtering stock in the metropolitan area, and I have clearly shown that the interests of the people generally will be sacrificed by it. I strongly oppose the Bill.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture): I shall comment on one or two statements made during the debate, because members may appreciate hearing a little more on some points. First, whilst there is an obvious connection between this Bill and the overtime ban applying at the abattoirs, the Bill is not in any way designed to upset the union or to generally destroy its work or anything of that nature. It is, however, as I previously said, connected with the present overtime ban. I have previously stated (and the problem is even more urgent today) that the timing of this ban is so inopportune from the State's point of view that something must be done. To my mind there is no point in singling out any section of the community, or criticizing the Abattoirs Board or the management for its efforts. I have much confidence in the board's handling of a singularly difficult and thankless task over the years. The fact remains, however, that whatever individual factors have caused these difficulties, there is room for more slaughtering capacity in the State. The board has to kill and handle not only for the local market but also the export market. It is one of the biggest abattoirs in Australia and the number of sheep and lambs it kills is enormous. I believe that during the 1959 drought, which was referred to by several members opposite, the killing of stock at the abattoirs amounted to more than 100,000 for a single week. That is why this Bill was not introduced in 1959, when there was a dry spell. Actually, it was more than a dry spell—it was a drought. I do not think that any abattoirs in the country has ever approached that number in one week.

Several members have raised the question of licences. One firm has been named by members opposite, sometimes in terms that are not merely derogatory but insulting, not only to the firm but to the Government as well. The Government considers them somewhat irresponsible remarks, but does not get excited about them. One Opposition member said the firm that had been mentioned so often had been planning for two years for this type of legislation.

Mr. Riches: That was the member for Stirling.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) said that William Angliss & Co. (Aus.) Pty. Ltd., had been preparing for two years for this type of legislation.

Mr. Riches: The member for Stirling said it this afternoon too.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Neither this firm nor any other firm knew that there was any thought in the mind of the Government of bringing in this Bill until a few days ago. The first statement in reference to any legislation was made in this House by me on September 18 in answer to a question. Since, I have been in touch with a large number of firms who are interested in the possibility of being licensed, but that is another matter.

In the matter of distributing licences, I suggest that the Minister has considerable power and responsibility and would need the assistance of an expert committee to assist him in awarding licences. Although it may not be final, the committee I suggest would be the Director of Agriculture, the Auditor-General, the General Manager of the Produce Department, and a Treasury officer; there may be one other. In any case it will be an expert committee to assess the need for and the result of any licence that may be granted. There is no need for the House to be fearful of a lack of security in the licences. The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) said that, if the Minister could grant a licence, he could, so to speak, eliminate one. That is perfectly correct under the Bill.

I suggest that the progress of the legislation would be as follows: the committee would discuss the need for a licence and recommend what should be done. For a beginning licences need not be granted on a long-term basis. If, later, a firm wishes to invest a large amount and erect extensive works, in that case it may be reasonable for it to ask for some indenture to be passed by Parliament. That has been done

for other industries. If they ask for something like that, it could be considered at the time. In the event of a heavy investment they may want a further indenture than merely a licence granted by the Minister. One must recognize the possibility of that and also the merits of that argument.

In licensing, some regard must be given to export killing. Local killing is not the only problem in this matter. The export market is the one that provides most of the problems. In the granting of long-term licences, killing for local requirements should not be the only matter considered. Beyond that, I cannot give greater detail until further evidence is received and applications for licences are examined. This Bill is of great importance. Probably in this State we have 3,000,000 sheep and lambs to be slaughtered this year. This Bill will help us to get on with the job.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (18).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman (teller), Coumbe, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Jenkins, Laucke, Millhouse, and Nankivell, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday McKee, Riches, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

Pair.—Aye—Sir Cecil Hincks. No—Mr. Ralston.

The SPEAKER: There are 18 Ayes and 18 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I cast my vote in accordance with the precedent established by previous Speakers. To enable the House to give further consideration to this matter, I support the second reading of the Bill. The question therefore passes in the affirmative.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—“Licence to slaughter elsewhere than at abattoirs of board”.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

After “slaughter” in subsection (1) to strike out “elsewhere than at the abattoirs of the board” and insert “anywhere outside the metropolitan abattoirs area”.

Proposed new section 70a (1) would then read:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act the Minister, if he is of the opinion that in the interests of the public it is expedient so to do, may grant a licence for such period as

he shall think fit to any person to slaughter, anywhere outside the metropolitan abattoirs area, any stock for sale for human consumption.

I do not dispute the sincerity of what the Minister has said in relation to this matter, but I believe that it is clear from the board's reports that the Metropolitan Abattoirs is quite capable of killing all the meat required for human consumption within the area that comes within the ambit of the board. It has been proved that there has been ample labour available to enable the Abattoirs Board to do all that is required of it. As I said earlier, I consider that this is panic legislation. We have read in the press recently that stock are starving at the Metropolitan Abattoirs, but this has been denied by other authorities, including the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and the Meat Industry Employees' Union. Statements attributed to the President of the National Farmers' Union have been denied by the authorities that I have mentioned. For some time, various authorities associated with primary production in this country have stated openly that owners and breeders of sheep and lambs have overstocked. Is there such a crisis here today? Does opportunity not exist near Adelaide for the stock to be slaughtered? I refer particularly to sheep and lambs.

During one by-election campaign I referred to the desirability of establishing meatworks away from Adelaide, but the producers rebuffed me. They would not agree because they wanted their stock sold at the Metropolitan Abattoirs. Perhaps they had a preference for that market. The board stated that it is able to slaughter all the stock needed for human consumption in the metropolitan area. My amendment will prevent the establishment within that area of additional slaughtering places. A chain system operates at the Metropolitan Abattoirs and the board is responsible for engaging the men to work it. Up to the present the board has been able to meet requirements, and I cannot see that it has been affected in any way by the overtime ban imposed by the workmen. At no time have they worked overtime on Mondays to Fridays. Some representations have been made on their behalf, and I referred to that in my second reading remarks. I was disappointed that the Government did nothing, but was pleased that the Speaker made some moves on behalf of the men. I consulted the same organizations as he did, and spent several hours discussing the matter. I hope the Government will accept my amendment, for it is in the interests of the Metropolitan Abattoirs and,

to a greater extent, in the interests of the State, because much money has been invested in the abattoirs.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture): The Government cannot accept the amendment and hopes that it will be defeated. If carried, it will take from the Bill about three-quarters of its value. The Opposition opposed the second reading, and now that the second reading has been carried it is endeavouring to reduce the Bill's effectiveness as much as possible. If carried, the amendment will impose an additional burden on primary producers. We do not want the Bill's effectiveness to be restricted in any way. If carried, the amendment will prevent meatworks from being established in about 1,000,000 acres of land within the metropolitan area, where two-thirds of the State's population live. That will be an absurd situation, but the Opposition is trying to upset the effectiveness of the measure.

When considering the establishment of an abattoir in an area all factors are dealt with, such as the site being close to ports for export purposes, the availability of men to work the abattoirs, conditions of management, transport of stock, and how the State's communications are designed. At present they are designed to bring produce to Adelaide. If the establishment of abattoirs in the metropolitan area is denied the Bill's effectiveness will be reduced considerably. The invitation to apply for licences should not be restricted, only to areas outside the metropolitan area.

Any abattoirs set up by licence under this Bill will have to compete with other works, not only in this State but in Victoria, and many of our lambs now go to Victoria every week for slaughter because they cannot be slaughtered here. We welcome the competition of Victorian buyers in the abattoirs, and we hope this will continue. These people have been ready to buy considerable numbers of lambs in the last few years, as they are doing at present. Everyone wants to see another bidder in the market, but there is no reason why our producers should have to suffer as a result. It costs 10s. a head to transport lambs from the market out of this State, and this is eventually reflected in the price to producers. We want to see that, in establishing some alternative killing site that will be economical and will compete with buyers from other States, the other demands of the export market are taken into account and that the works will be able to make a profit. We will not

get people interested in this industry unless they are allowed to make a profit, and we do not want to restrict them by saying where they cannot operate. Local killing is not the only thing involved; export killing is an important side of our economy. It is a difficult type of killing because it has all sorts of requirements that cannot be met without some recourse to a local market.

Members will remember that a few years ago I brought in an amending Bill to provide that reject carcasses from export killing could be sold in the metropolitan area under certain conditions. That was introduced to enable exporters to get rid of export carcasses which otherwise would have limited their ability to kill. The local market is inextricably tied up with it, and the purpose of the Leader's amendment is merely to limit the operations and applications of the Bill. If members opposite persist in supporting the amendment, I am afraid they will destroy much of the goodwill they have established in talking so freely about the need for primary producers' problems to be solved. If they hold up this legislation and try to destroy the Bill they will be held to account. It is unfair to place a further burden on the primary producer by restricting the site of the abattoirs to a place outside the metropolitan area. We have probably 3,000,000 or more sheep and lambs in this State to be killed, and this Bill will enable us to get on with that.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I do not accept the Minister's explanation. He spoke about 60 per cent of the population, but I thought the Government was trying to bring about decentralization. Regarding the 1,000,000 acres he mentioned, if the Premier were here he would perhaps say that this could be increased by including Gawler, Morphett Vale and Elizabeth. I am concerned about the establishment of any other slaughtering facilities within the metropolitan area, for which I see no reason. The Metropolitan Abattoirs Board has a duty to the people of this State to supply a guaranteed type of meat for human consumption, and it has endeavoured to carry out this obligation. If other abattoirs are established in the metropolitan area, there is no guarantee that they will be able to compete against abattoirs in other States; there is no guarantee even under the present set-up. The Minister admits that Victorian buyers come here to buy in quantity if a suitable type of lamb or mutton can be bought. Their views are no different now from what they have been for some years. I have been told that

Victorian buyers are prepared to go farther than Gepps Cross if necessary.

Mr. Heaslip: They do go farther, but the primary producer has to pay all the freight.

Mr. Casey: Rubbish!

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I do not know whether the honourable member is trying to tell me I have to pay freight because someone in the Rocky River District wants to sell lambs to people in Victoria.

Mr. Heaslip: Unfortunately, it happened last week; 9s. a head to Victoria.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I did not have to pay for it.

Mr. Heaslip: We did.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Probably the honourable member had already told his constituents that, in the interests of the safety of their flocks, they had better start reducing—and this would have happened earlier this year. Members opposite who say that we are not interested in primary producers have another think coming. I ask members to support my amendment.

Mr. SHANNON: This amendment emasculates the Bill. What is its effect on the people of the State? Some people in industry are denying their own wages board, for which they themselves selected their representatives, the opportunity of adjudicating on their claim. An attempt has been made by the employees at the abattoirs to defeat the machinery set up for their protection. I have no complaint about Mr. Pirie. He is a fair man. It is a pity he did not have three others of like character with him. Last April Mr. Pirie, on behalf of the employees, accepted a determination covering the conditions under which the men worked.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. SHANNON: I believe I can see in this amendment a move to protect these men. It is framed with one object: to protect the people who will defy the ordinary processes of law, the basis upon which our industrial life is operating. If I am wrong in this, I will listen to you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I have indicated to the honourable member that he must confine his remarks to this amendment.

Mr. SHANNON: I agree. For your guidance in this matter, I say the amendment proposes to keep a close conclave in the metropolitan area for these employees who at present are defying their own wages board. The Opposition cannot deny there was a strange set of circumstances in that, when a change in the personnel of the board was made in August of this year, we immediately had this trouble on

our heels. Can the Opposition explain that away? The Leader contends that his amendment is designed in the interests of the people of this State generally, including producers and consumers. If the Leader has his way, any further killing works dealing with the producers' stock will suffer two disabilities. The first will be in respect of transporting the stock to the killing works, wherever it may be established. It could be at Kadina, Naracoorte or Penola, which are obvious examples; on the other hand, it could be on a site nearer the metropolitan area, just on the fringe. We have one at Noarlunga and another at Strathalbyn. If such fringe killing works are to be the means of overcoming the present impasse in getting our stock slaughtered, there will be some rejects that cannot be exported because of bruises or minor defects that do not render the meat unfit for human consumption but deny it the right of export, so that it will have to be consumed locally. Extra rail freight will be incurred, which will be a further charge upon the producer. There will also be an extra charge upon the consumer in respect of the transport back to the metropolitan area of that meat rejected for export, which will be used on the local market.

This amendment would defeat the purposes of the Bill, which makes it possible for the Minister in his discretion to grant a licence. It is obvious that this Bill aims at overcoming the present situation whereby a group of persons can, at the appropriate time, say, "If you don't meet our demands we will not kill your stock. We won't work overtime." Opposition members claim that there is no shortage of meat in the metropolitan area. Of course there is not. We are not concerned with that, but we are concerned with meat for export and with getting rid of our surplus stock. I can remember when, through industrial disputes, the abattoirs was closed. I brought country-killed meat to the city to enable some Opposition members to provide their families with meat. When the demand for killing is at its greatest, a gun is held at our heads. I cannot understand the attitude of members opposite who represent country districts.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are dealing with the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition, not with the legislation generally.

Mr. SHANNON: His amendment will result in the country killing of stock and not with the killing of stock in the metropolitan area.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable member confine his remarks to that?

Mr. SHANNON: The amendment will deny the primary producer the right to have his stock killed where he can obtain the greatest possible profit. The amendment will result in his having his stock killed outside the metropolitan area. The Metropolitan Abattoirs has a stranglehold on the present metropolitan market and any competitor will have to fight for part of that market, but the Opposition seeks to deny anyone the right to compete. I do not know how any member who claims to be a supporter of primary producers can support this amendment.

Mr. LOVEDAY: The Minister admits that this amendment could remove 75 per cent of the value of the Bill. The member for Onkaparinga suggests 99 per cent.

Mr. Shannon: That is nearer the mark.

Mr. LOVEDAY: That is the best admission we have yet had that this Bill is essentially designed to permit the establishment of another metropolitan abattoirs. The Minister suggested that the present abattoirs was not sufficient to meet the metropolitan and export requirements, but at present there is unused capacity at the abattoirs. An inquiry into the abattoirs in 1958—I believe it was the last inquiry—reported as follows:

It is considered that the board is implementing a progressive policy of modernization of works to enable it to meet the demands of the State's development.

The establishment of another metropolitan abattoirs would place the present abattoirs at a grave disadvantage. The export side of the abattoirs' business has been the major contributing factor to its losses over the years, as revealed by the annual reports. The Minister did not say that any new abattoirs would be restricted to a service abattoirs. In other words it would be able to buy and sell stock, whereas the Metropolitan Abattoirs cannot. The new abattoirs would have to make a profit and so it would not be particularly interested in the less profitable part of the Metropolitan Abattoirs' operations. It would seek the cream of the slaughtering in the metropolitan area to the disadvantage of the existing abattoirs. I fail to see how that will assist the primary producer and the community. If private enterprise can get a stranglehold on the business and run at a profit, it will not worry about facilities for primary producers and, consequently, the deficits of the Metropolitan Abattoirs will increase.

The member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) accused the Opposition of being concerned only with centralization. Our amendment seeks to provide for decentralization. He said that we wanted to have continued the monopoly in the metropolitan area. If he favours decentralization, we will be interested to see how he votes on this amendment. The Minister did not advance one good reason to justify the establishment of another metropolitan abattoirs. He said that the Bill would not solve the present problem. The Chairman of the Operational Committee of the Meat Board has stated that the present bank-up of stock will be cleared by October 10.

Mr. Heaslip: He is speaking only of sheep in the paddocks at the abattoirs. What about the sheep in the country?

Mr. LOVEDAY: The honourable member has made it clear that he wants another metropolitan abattoirs to compete with the present abattoirs. He is not concerned with the present situation, but with providing competition for the Metropolitan Abattoirs. The Minister has not advanced one sound reason why the amendment should be opposed. The abattoirs possesses unused capacity capable of meeting the State's development. Therefore, the Committee should accept the amendment.

Mr. HEASLIP: Apparently, members opposite do not think an extra abattoirs is necessary. They are concerned with everything but the slaughtering and disposal of 3,000,000 surplus sheep in South Australia. Last week I sold sheep for as low as 6s. a head and they went to Victoria. Had I been able to sell them at the abattoirs I would probably have received 14s. for them. The abattoirs could have dealt with them, but the ban meant that they had to be sent to Victoria. This urgent Bill aims to dispose of surplus South Australian sheep, because the abattoirs is not capable of coping with them. If the employees were prepared to work overtime many of the sheep could be handled, but the abattoirs is not capable of handling all of them, because the drought conditions have caused a big influx of stock.

Mr. Clark: Why not set up another abattoirs?

Mr. HEASLIP: That is the aim of the Bill, which will allow fringe abattoirs to sell their products in the metropolitan area. The Bill will allow anyone desirous of establishing an abattoirs in the metropolitan area to dispose of some of his products in that area.

Mr. Clark: As long as it is private.

Mr. HEASLIP: It does not matter whether it is private as long as we can get rid of our stock. The £2,000,000 invested in the Metropolitan Abattoirs is small compared with the losses incurred on stock because primary producers cannot dispose of them. I wish to dispel any doubts on this Bill, the object of which is to ensure the disposal of surplus stock with which the abattoirs cannot cope. I agree with the member for Onkaparinga that if the amendment were accepted the Bill would lose 95 per cent of its effectiveness.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I am sorry that it is necessary for me to correct some misapprehensions. No attempt has been made by the Opposition through this amendment to deny primary producers the right to dispose of their stock. No need exists for abattoirs to be limited to the metropolitan area. The member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) spoke of 3,000,000 sheep, but I disclosed earlier that the abattoirs had slaughtered more sheep this year than in any previous year, even when droughts or bushfires were experienced. If the employees of the Abattoirs Board were to work to full capacity they could account for only 14,400 sheep or lambs each shift. A 3,000,000 surplus could not be dealt with except for assistance from Victoria, and that was indicated by the Minister. I would tell the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon), if he were present, that I have not at any stage mentioned wages or conditions or anything concerning the present administration of the Abattoirs Board.

The Government has never assisted fringe slaughterhouses. The 1958 amendment to the Act provided that meat unfit for export could be brought into the metropolitan area and used for home consumption, but the Government has never gone out of its way to assist fringe slaughterhouses by providing meat inspectors. That is a most important point. There is probably room for more fringe slaughterhouses. No inspectors have been sent out for many years to assist them.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Are you prepared to help them?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I can tell the Government how it can help those people. My colleague, the member for Frome, has indicated that Victorian buyers have been as far north as Peterborough. Those buyers would not be there unless they were after profit; they are not producers, slaughtermen, or butchers, or engaged in the industry in any way, but are simply dealing in stock. I oppose the creation

of any more slaughterhouses within the metropolitan abattoirs area, but if the Government wishes to create other slaughterhouses, whether in the fringe metropolitan area or country areas, I will go out of my way to help it. That is the reason for my amendment.

Mr. HUGHES: The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) said he was at a loss to understand how country members of my Party were going to explain to their constituents their attitude to this Bill. I am not afraid to face my primary producers over my attitude to the Bill. It was my privilege recently to open the Northern Yorke Peninsula Division of the Wheat and Woolgrowers' Conference at Moonta, and not once on that occasion was I approached about my attitude to this Bill. I took that as a vote of confidence in their member's approach to this matter. The member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) said that it appeared that members of the Opposition opposed the establishment of a second abattoirs, but I assure him that we on this side of the House do not oppose a second abattoirs in this State.

Mr. Hall: But you put qualifications on it.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. I asked the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) last week, by interjection, whether he was in favour of country abattoirs, and he said that he certainly was. I was very pleased to hear that, because every member on this side favours a second abattoirs so long as it is established in the country, and that is all this amendment seeks. If the Bill were to go through in its present form it would demonstrate once again the Government's attitude to decentralization. If the Minister is so anxious to further the interests of primary producers, perhaps he can explain why he has taken so long to introduce this type of legislation. Why were steps not taken by him or his predecessors to prevent losses to the primary producers as a result of the problems associated with the gluts that occur at the peak of the most favourable lamb season? I think all honourable members in this House know that in the past gluts occurred more than once, and insufficient facilities existed at the abattoirs to regulate the flow of stock from producers, yet no legislation was introduced.

I am just as anxious as any member opposite that the producer be able to market his stock at the right time. I am equally anxious that stock be put through the abattoirs under conditions whereby the interests of all sections of the community are properly preserved. The Government has stated that any reduction in

output has a highly deleterious effect on the interests of primary producers and that the State's economy suffers as a result of the losses of export killing. If that is true, then the powers that be have neglected their responsibilities to the primary producer and to the export trade by not introducing legislation in the past to provide for more slaughtering of stock during the glut periods that have occurred. We all know that expansion is essential in the slaughtering and treatment of stock, and that such expansion is essential to the welfare of the industry. However, that expansion will not be achieved by providing a second killing works in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Nankivell: But your amendment would allow another killing works 15 miles from the General Post Office, would it not?

Mr. HUGHES: Then why does the honourable member object to the amendment?

Mr. Nankivell: Because it means nothing.

Mr. HUGHES: If the slaughtering and treatment capacity of the Metropolitan Abattoirs has reached its limit and the abattoirs cannot handle all the stock under normal conditions, the alternative is to establish killing and freezing works in the north, preferably at Wallaroo. Such was the recommendation of a former General Manager of the Government Produce Department.

Mr. Hall: My people don't want to take their stock to Wallaroo.

Mr. HUGHES: An abattoirs there would be a branch of the Metropolitan Abattoirs. I am not concerned about where the member for Gouger wants to take his stock—

Mr. Hall: Of course you aren't.

Mr. HUGHES: —but I am vitally concerned for the people in my district and those on Yorke Peninsula. I would hope that the member for Gouger would take his bull somewhere else. Last February an excellent case was presented to the Minister of Agriculture for his co-operation in the establishment of a branch of the Metropolitan Abattoirs at Wallaroo or near Kadina. This afternoon I questioned the Minister on the matter, but was disappointed with his reply. After waiting so long I thought he would have been able to answer the question more fully. When he received the deputation he said he would get reports from the Metropolitan Abattoirs Board and the General Manager of the Government Produce Department. I thought he would not have forgotten his promise, but he said today he had not been approached by the board. I do not know whether he avoided the issue because of the

Bill now before us, but he may have had a good reason for his statement. I think the problem now existing at the abattoirs would have been avoided if the proposals put forward by the deputation had been adopted.

Mr. Lawn: If abattoirs had been established at Wallaroo it would have been a great help to the member for Rocky River.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. Producers in that area would have been helped considerably. The member for Rocky River supports what I am saying.

Mr. Jenkins: Why doesn't someone get a licence to start an abattoirs in the area? Under the Bill one could be obtained.

Mr. HUGHES: I hope the honourable member is not fooling himself, for he is not fooling me, or any Opposition member.

Mr. Jenkins: Why not get a licence?

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member should not be so foolish.

Mr. Jenkins: There is nothing to stop it.

Mr. HUGHES: The Bill was introduced with the one intention of supporting a policy of centralization, and nothing else. I support the amendment.

Mr. RICHES: I, too, support the amendment. Out of this discussion have come some interesting points, and the debate has shown the attitude of members towards the general question of decentralization. This question of additional meatworks has been a live one in Parliament for some years. From time to time Opposition members have suggested an inquiry on whether industries ancillary to primary production, such as meatworks, should be established in country areas. Several years ago Parliament referred the matter to the Industries Development Committee, sitting as a special committee. Even before it has presented a report on the matter, the Minister has shown that he has no faith in the establishment of country meatworks, and has circumvented the committee's report by asking members to agree to the establishment of such works in the metropolitan area without restriction. In its inquiries the committee has visited most parts of the State and taken evidence from organizations and individual producers. Almost everywhere meatworks in the country have been suggested and there have been protests against their establishment in the metropolitan area. Apparently dissatisfied with the time taken by the committee in presenting a report, Kadina people have made direct representations to the Minister of Agriculture, and Penola people direct representations to the Premier. They were assisted by

one honourable member, who prepared their case. Soon, his view on this matter will be of interest to members. It was said that abattoirs should be established in the Penola area. The direct representations for country meatworks have come from areas where sheep are produced.

Mr. Nankivell: Bordertown? Were not country people asked to present a case for their individual towns? They were asked whether they would like industries established in their towns.

Mr. RICHES: The honourable member is correct. Each centre was sent a copy of the committee's terms of reference, the first of which was whether industries ancillary to primary production, such as meatworks, should be established in country areas. The committee was not invited to Bordertown to take evidence, but people came from that town to Adelaide to present evidence. They were definite in wanting a meatworks there, not in the metropolitan area, and I do not think they have changed their minds. The people of Penola were advised officially by their adviser from the Wheat and Woolgrowers Federation that if another meatworks were established in the metropolitan area they could forget all about another meatworks in the South-East. We are voting on whether it is better to have meat killed at the point of production or at the market.

Mr. Jenkins: How many meatworks should be established throughout the country?

Mr. RICHES: I recently saw a film produced by the New South Wales Agriculture Department that I should like members to see. It showed that there were 27 different killing works supplying the Homebush abattoirs in New South Wales, and indicated that this was working successfully. The department must have considered this successful or it would not have gone to the expense of having a colour film made. I do not know how many meatworks there would be; that would depend on their size and on whether there would be one big works or many smaller works. One thing was made clear to the committee—that, apart from Penola (which wanted to establish a meatworks), in every other case witnesses suggested that they should have the right to buy and slaughter stock and to sell meat on practically the same basis as the meatworks now operating in Peterborough and as was proposed for Naracoorte. They also envisaged a monopoly of operation in the area—and that is what causes me great concern about this legislation, which I think

cuts across the whole concept of country abattoirs. I ask members to examine carefully the effect it would have in areas that are declared abattoirs areas in which decently controlled abattoirs have been set up.

I am referring to such places as Port Pirie, Whyalla, Port Augusta and Mount Gambier, where the abattoirs depend on killing for the local district. In all these districts there is agitation by people who think they can kill cheaply under a tree, but what is the attitude of Government members towards these monopolies? They are monopolies, but they are controlled by the people; representatives of the people are on their boards. Last week, in reply to a question I asked about Penola, the Premier said that the Government was prepared to grant licences to country abattoirs to sell meat in the metropolitan area, but that this applied to only 50 per cent of the throughput. This Bill will enable the whole lot to be slaughtered in the metropolitan area; it does not even place a proposed metropolitan abattoirs on the same basis as that offered in the past by the Government to those interested in establishing country abattoirs.

There is no restraint under the Bill; none of the restrictions placed on people desiring to set up an abattoirs in a country area will be imposed on a fringe abattoirs. The Minister will be able to give any privilege he likes. If this had obtained before, applications would have been made regarding country abattoirs. I have been told on good authority that inquiries are now being made of the Premier about establishing an abattoirs not 50 miles from Adelaide to serve terrific areas in the South-East and along the River Murray. Members opposite say that it is not economical to send sheep to a country abattoirs, but I have been told by farmers that it is economical to send sheep to Melbourne. The member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) is not the first to do this; people were sending sheep there before there was any overtime ban.

Mr. Heaslip: There is no option now. We have to do it.

Mr. RICHES: Some farmers were doing this as a matter of choice before the overtime ban.

Mr. Heaslip: It was a different price then.

Mr. RICHES: There was no overtime ban then but, because it paid them better, they sent sheep to Melbourne. Farmers can sell where they get a better price. They can sell this week if the price suits them and they can hold on next week if it does not, but the workman who sells his labour has no choice.

He has to work seven days a week in the knowledge that he is not adequately covered by sick leave. Employees in this industry must be among the few who do not have these provisions.

Mr. Heaslip: This has nothing to do with the clause.

Mr. RICHES: I will not give the honourable member the opportunity to object; I will say more on the third reading. Members opposite have not had any regard to decentralization. It is interesting to note that the Minister, when speaking in 1952 on a motion about whether an inquiry should be made into whether it was desirable that meatworks be established in country districts, said he did not support meatworks in country districts. The motion then was that a Royal Commission be set up to inquire into the advisability of establishing an ancillary industry, particularly in country districts. The Minister opposed that motion and, in particular, expressed the opinion that it was not feasible that a killing works be established in the country.

The member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) has indicated that he is not sympathetic to the establishment of abattoirs in country areas. He said he wanted to send his stock to the city. The voting on this clause will decide whether abattoirs should be established in country areas near the stock or whether it should be established near the metropolitan area with better access to markets. The consensus of opinion of country people generally is that an abattoirs be established in the country. Another fear expressed was that, when an abattoirs was established, the number of bidders at the markets seemed to be reduced. I warn the Committee of this possibility that, if a large-scale abattoirs is built in the metropolitan area and operated privately, whether it be by W. Angliss & Company or by another company, there are people bidding now who will not bid then. The competition will be weaker, not stronger. That has already happened in some places. One big argument that the people in the South-East put to the Industries Development Special Committee in favour of an abattoirs at Penola was that there were not sufficient buyers at the markets, and that they arranged among themselves not to compete with each other. If we build up a big organization in the metropolitan area, operated privately, some of the smaller buyers will go to the wall; they will not be able to live with it.

There is not a small butcher operating in Adelaide who would welcome W. Angliss & Company's coming in. The whole of

this Bill (and, in particular, this clause) can embarrass only one organization in South Australia—the Metropolitan Abattoirs Board. For the life of me, I do not know why the Government has not said that it has done a good job. It has not explained why the machinery at the board's disposal is not operating to full capacity at a time when the greatest possible throughput is demanded and we have not been told that further equipment and machinery are necessary. If they were, we would ask why it is that the board has not provided them.

If another complete killing works is required, why does the Government not establish it? It claims that the plant at the abattoirs is sufficient if it is all working, but it is not all working. Does the Minister tell us that he has brought in this Bill on the advice of the Metropolitan Abattoirs Board? Who has advised him in this matter? This Bill, despite the protests of the Minister and of the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall), has been introduced for the reason mentioned by the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke)—to deal with a particular situation. Legislation introduced to deal with a particular situation is rarely good and ought not to be discussed in the atmosphere that has developed around the operations of the abattoirs in recent weeks. This measure cannot possibly affect that situation. The atmosphere is not good. The Bill has been introduced, not on the advice of the Metropolitan Abattoirs Board to provide better killing facilities for producers but over and above the heads of the board and, I suggest, against its wishes, for the express purpose outlined by the member for Burra in his speech on the second reading. That would not commend the Bill to any reasonable man.

I hope that the Committee will seriously consider the vote to be taken on this amendment, because so much is involved. The vote will be watched with much interest by the public. In that, I agree with the members for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) and Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon). I, for one, will be proud to go to any district and explain my vote on this amendment—that I am in favour of abattoirs in country districts.

Mr. QUIRKE: The member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) said he would be interested to see how I voted on the amendment; and, realizing the importance of the Bill, would I reject the amendment? The Bill provides:

The Minister . . . may grant a licence for such period as he shall think fit to any person to slaughter, elsewhere than at the abattoirs of the board, any stock for sale for human consumption.

That means that anywhere in South Australia, including the metropolitan area, with the consent of the Minister an abattoirs can be established. The amendment excludes the metropolitan area, so any new abattoirs would have to be situated in the country or on the perimeter of the metropolitan area. In any event, another abattoirs could not be established in the metropolitan area because there would be no room for it. Local health regulations would exclude its establishment in the metropolitan area. Under the Bill an abattoirs can be established anywhere, including the metropolitan area. Members opposite advocate abattoirs in country areas, but who will build them? Is not the Opposition suggesting that the Government should build country abattoirs? The Bill does not prevent anyone from going into the country.

Mr. McKee: You're right off the rails.

Mr. QUIRKE: I am not. The Bill permits it, and moreover the Opposition has boasted that should it ever become the Government, this would be its strongest weapon for doing what it wants to do.

Mr. Loveday: Why does the amendment destroy 99 per cent of the Bill?

Mr. QUIRKE: Did I say that?

Mr. Loveday: No, but the member for Onkaparinga did.

Mr. QUIRKE: But I didn't. I am not my brother's keeper.

Mr. Ryan: Not much!

Mr. QUIRKE: Wait a minute! It is always interesting that when salient features, which the Opposition has not considered, are brought out, members opposite raise their voices and try to introduce extraneous issues. The facts are that any company, any group of persons or any person can seek a permit for a country abattoirs and the Minister, exercising his discretion, can grant it. Members opposite say, "That would not happen. No-one would go to the country." They laugh to scorn the suggestion that a private individual might want to go to the country. They want another Government-sponsored abattoirs.

Mr. Nankivell: As at Port Lincoln.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes. The Opposition cannot think of other than Government abattoirs. The Bill will enable anyone to go to the country. The Government could establish another abattoirs in the country, or on the perimeter of the metropolitan area.

Mr. Riches: Where is the perimeter?

Mr. QUIRKE: Outside the boundary of the metropolitan area, which is defined in one Act.

Mr. Riches: The Bill would allow another abattoirs in the metropolitan area.

Mr. QUIRKE: I know, but that is not likely because there is no room for it. It could be regarded as a noxious trade. If a Government-sponsored abattoirs were established at Wallaroo would every farmer within a prescribed area be compelled to send his stock to it?

Mr. Hughes: The figures I have before me would encourage farmers to support it.

Mr. QUIRKE: Any country abattoirs, no matter where it were placed, would have to compete with the attraction of the city. That is the major difficulty of country abattoirs, and we know it.

Mr. Nankivell: The big market.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes. The Leader gave the game away when he said that about 14,000 animals could be killed each shift at the Metropolitan Abattoirs and therefore it was necessary to send stock to Victoria in any event. The obvious conclusion from that is that we need another abattoirs. He said that it should be anywhere but in the metropolitan area. Where would it be? I suggest it would be about 15 miles away. Where would the Opposition draw its line to exclude it from the metropolitan area? Members opposite have not answered that. This Bill will enable the establishment of new abattoirs anywhere. An abattoirs would have to be strategically placed in relation to stock supplies. The member for Wallaroo may have figures to indicate that an abattoirs could operate successfully at Wallaroo. All right! Why not permit someone to establish an abattoirs there? Must it be a Government-sponsored abattoirs? Why should public money be spent on such an establishment? A new abattoirs will not be in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Riches: The Minister said it will.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: I said nothing of the sort.

Mr. QUIRKE: There is no hope of its being anywhere in the metropolitan area.

Mr. McKee: It would not be far out.

Mr. QUIRKE: How would the amendment stop that?

Mr. Bywaters: Why couldn't it be in the metropolitan area?

Mr. QUIRKE: There is no land for it, and it would be a noxious trade.

Mr. Bywaters: There is land at Dry Creek and Wingfield.

Mr. QUIRKE: That is not the metropolitan area.

Mr. Bywaters: The present abattoirs is there.

Mr. QUIRKE: Do members want another abattoirs there? It would not be permitted within the metropolitan area. One member suggested moving the abattoirs.

Mr. Bywaters: That was the former member for Chaffey.

Mr. QUIRKE: He suggested moving the abattoirs because it was a noxious trade. No-one would be permitted to establish another abattoirs in the metropolitan area. The Town Planner would have something to say about it.

Mr. Jennings: There is a noxious area at Dry Creek.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, but that is completely unsuitable for stock yards and nobody with any sense would dream of putting an abattoirs there, because the driest available ground is needed. The Bill provides a far wider scope than the amendment for establishing killing works in the country. The amendment aims to exclude them from the metropolitan area. That is absolutely unnecessary as they will never be allowed there. I support the Bill as originally drafted.

Mr. LAWN: The member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) was challenged by the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday). Mr. Quirke said that the clause embodied the whole of the State, but I will tell the Committee what the Minister said the clause meant. The honourable member also said there was insufficient land in the metropolitan area for another abattoirs. In my speech on the second reading I said that land was held at Dry Creek by W. Angliss & Company, which was waiting for the green light to enable it to proceed with the building of a killing works. Plans were prepared two years ago. My statement has not been challenged. The question of the licence does not come into the matter. I know that a licence is necessary. The Minister should know what the Government's intention is. The member for Burra said that the Opposition favoured country abattoirs provided the Government built them, but the amendment does not mention Government abattoirs. It leaves licensing in the hands of the Minister. However, slaughtering will be done only by licence, but outside the metropolitan area. Members on this side have repeatedly advocated country abattoirs, not

necessarily country slaughterhouses or a branch of the present abattoirs set up by the Government. My Party has advocated the establishment of country slaughterhouses or abattoirs when its members have spoken on decentralization. Country members on this side desire slaughterhouses in their districts. Indeed, the member for Wallaroo introduced a deputation of primary producers who desired an abattoirs at Wallaroo or Kadina. I believe a private abattoirs at Wallaroo would meet the wishes of primary producers. The Opposition is not asking the Government to spend public money in establishing country abattoirs. The member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) said that the Opposition was against the establishment of a second abattoirs, but a conflict exists between that member and the member for Burra, who said that the Opposition wanted abattoirs established at the expense of taxpayers, but Mr. Heaslip said that my Party was opposed to the establishment of a second abattoirs.

The Minister in his second reading explanation said that the purpose of the Bill was to provide for the Minister to be able to grant licences for slaughtering stock and the sale of meat within the metropolitan area. Can anyone doubt what the Minister meant? The member for Burra was speaking for home consumption. If there is any honest doubt in members' minds as to what was meant they can read the Minister's second reading explanation on page 1032 of *Hansard* and that will leave no doubt as to the intention of the Bill. Does that statement mean the whole State? It definitely means the metropolitan area. The Minister continued:

The Government has for some years had a stated intention of providing killing licences for country abattoirs where these can be established. However, this has not been availed of. The reason is partly due to the ready market to be found in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Nankivell: Isn't that right?

Mr. LAWN: I am only quoting what the Minister said. When members say that this means the whole State they are denying what the Minister said. The Minister continued:

The Metropolitan Abattoirs has been for many years in a favoured position in regard to the Adelaide market as the introduction of meat slaughtered by other interests is strictly controlled.

[*Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.*]

Mr. LAWN: Before the adjournment I referred to another sentence of the Minister wherein he said that the Metropolitan Abattoirs had been in a favoured position for many years as the meat slaughtered by other interests was

strictly controlled. There again, he is saying that clause 3 is designed for the purpose of permitting him to issue licences to have meat slaughtered by interests other than the Metropolitan Abattoirs. He said:

Many of the installations at Gepps Cross are sufficiently large to cater for a population increase in the Adelaide area. It is felt, however, that difficulties of management and operation make it advisable for licences to be granted to other persons for the killing of stock.

He did not say what those difficulties of operation and management were. However, he has made it abundantly clear to any thinking person that the intention of clause 3 is to permit him to issue licences in the metropolitan area. Let us get clear the difference between the Bill and the amendment. If anyone can see in the amendment that the Opposition wants country abattoirs set up by the Government, then I would say it is a figment of his imagination. Clause 3 states:

The following section is inserted in the principal Act after section 70 thereof:

70a. (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act the Minister, if he is of the opinion that in the interests of the public it is expedient so to do, may grant a licence for such period as he shall think fit to any person to slaughter, elsewhere than at the abattoirs of the board, any stock for sale for human consumption.

Under the amendment moved by the Leader, proposed new section 70a (1) would read:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act the Minister, if he is of the opinion that in the interests of the public it is expedient so to do, may grant a licence for such period as he thinks fit to any person to slaughter, anywhere outside the metropolitan abattoirs area, any stock for sale for human consumption.

Therefore, it is obvious that the only difference between the two matters before the Committee is that in one proposal the slaughtering shall be inside the metropolitan area and in the other proposal it shall be outside the metropolitan area. The Opposition does not object to the issue of licences or to the Minister's having the right to grant licences.

Mr. Nankivell: You said in your second reading speech that you would scrub them off, if necessary.

Mr. LAWN: I made no such statement. What I said was that if this Bill was passed in its present form, as explained by the Minister of Agriculture, and licences were issued, when the Labor Party took over the Treasury benches it would cancel the licences—what the honourable member refers to as “scrubbing them off”. On that occasion I was speaking about a change of Government after this Act

becomes law, if it does become law, whereas at present I am speaking of the two proposals before the Committee. I have made it clear that the only difference is whether the licences for slaughtering shall be granted within the metropolitan area or outside the metropolitan area. The Opposition is endeavouring to decentralize slaughtering and have it done in country areas, and if country members of the Government do not want slaughtering in their districts there are plenty of country Opposition members who would be glad to have it done in their districts.

If the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) meant what he said, he should have slaughtering works as near as possible to his grazing property, because it would save all the expense of trucking or railing stock to Adelaide. In addition, I suppose stock lose condition when they have to travel longer distances. I would think that if the honourable member was sincere in his advocacy, he would like to see country meatworks established in the district of Wallaroo.

Mr. Heaslip: I am not opposing that at all.

Mr. LAWN: The amendment could mean that.

Mr. Heaslip: So could the Bill.

Mr. LAWN: The amendment gives the Minister the right to establish an abattoirs or a slaughterhouse in the Rocky River district but prohibits him from establishing one in the metropolitan area. The member for Rocky River is always accusing the Opposition of thinking only of the metropolitan area; he did that when I spoke on the second reading debate. He interpreted my remarks as meaning that I could think only of the metropolitan area. I am proving now that the honourable member does not want a meatworks in his area.

Mr. Heaslip: I did not say that.

Mr. LAWN: He wants it in the metropolitan area. The amendment will permit the Minister, who is a member of the same political Party as the member for Rocky River (which means that the honourable member would have more influence with the Minister to have a meatworks established in his district than would any member on this side of the House), to grant a licence to a country killing works. The Opposition knows why the member for Rocky River and other Government country members do not want meatworks established in their areas.

Mr. McKee: They might bring more Labor voters.

Mr. LAWN: Yes. Would the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) like to see a few more workers in his district?

Mr. Laucke: I certainly would.

Mr. LAWN: Why do honourable members think the Premier is talking so much now about altering the districts? Part of the re-arrangement is for the purpose of safeguarding Barossa.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to come back to clause 3.

Mr. LAWN: I have not departed from it, Mr. Chairman; I am debating why Government members are deliberately misinterpreting the clause. The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) this afternoon said that the abattoirs employees were acting in defiance of their wages board. Either he is misrepresenting the position deliberately in that respect, or he just does not know. When a group of workers act in defiance of their wages tribunal it means that they are taking direct action against some provision of their award. These men are not acting in defiance of their award or of their wages board; if they were doing so, the board would have the power to go to court and ask for the men to be convicted for contempt. The member for Onkaparinga has a false knowledge of industrial matters.

Mr. McKee: He hasn't any knowledge.

Mr. LAWN: Either he has no knowledge of industrial matters or he is deliberately misrepresenting the position. He also said that the Opposition's amendment would place an extra charge on the consumers. However, I think the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) this afternoon amply demonstrated that it is the Bill itself and not the Opposition's amendment that places an additional charge on the consumer or the producer. The amendment would permit the Minister to allow slaughterhouses to be opened in various parts of the State, where producers would have less expense in taking in their stock; therefore, the price to consumers would be lower, and the meat would be in better condition. Government members have laid much stress on these additional costs to consumers. As with other public utilities, there would be a provision preventing the board from making excess profits. It would serve the interests of the producers and the consumers. No-one can tell me that private enterprise would establish meatworks under clause 3 to meet the interests of producers and consumers. Did Angliss make his millions thinking of the interests of consumers? The firm has been out to make a profit. Under the Bill consumers would have to pay more for

meat than under the amendment, and under the suggestion by the member for Wallaroo. Government members have said that the establishment of additional meatworks would prevent similar trouble to that now occurring at the abattoirs, but the men who worked for private enterprise, wherever the works may be established, would be members of the same organization as the men now working at the abattoirs.

Mr. Nankivell: Port Lincoln is not banning overtime.

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member is deliberately misrepresenting the position or does not understand it. I said that if another meatworks were established under the Bill the employees would be members of the same organization as the present employees at the abattoirs.

Mr. Nankivell: And that is the position at Port Lincoln, where there is no overtime ban.

Mr. Heaslip: There is no ban there.

Mr. LAWN: Because there is a difference between Port Lincoln and the metropolitan area. If another meatworks were established in the metropolitan area by private enterprise the employees would be members of the same organization as the men now working at the abattoirs.

Mr. McKee: There is no ban at Port Lincoln because the men are not asked to work overtime.

Mr. Heaslip: There is at Noarlunga.

Mr. LAWN: My point is that the men engaged at any new meatworks would be members of the same organization as the present employees at the abattoirs. The organization would not permit the men to work under conditions at one place to the detriment of men working in another place.

Mr. Hall: What about the payment of incentives?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There are too many interjections.

Mr. LAWN: All over Australia under any award some employers pay incentives and some do not, and does this cause industrial strife? Under an industrial award there is no exemption for the employer who gives something better. Decisions are made for the industry generally and for the workmen to benefit as a whole. Of course, if one employer granted members of the union two weeks' sick leave the union might exempt that employer, and it would make such a decision if it suited the union. If we have another slaughterhouse the position will not be altered in any way.

The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) said that Opposition members were denying the humanitarian rights of people to eat meat, but has anybody ever heard such a stupid statement? In this debate only the member for Onkaparinga has suggested that there is a shortage of meat. It could be said that he is preventing people from eating margarine. According to my doctor I should be on an animal fat-free diet. We cannot buy margarine, and the honourable member has tried to stop its sale, because he is a member of the South Australian Farmers' Co-operative Union. Haven't I the humanitarian right to eat margarine if I want to? Like the member for Rocky River, he is putting up anything to make some sort of defence.

I now want to refer to a reply given to me today by the Minister of Agriculture. He said that during the period January 1, 1961, to December 31, 1961, of the 1,203 union personnel employed by the Abattoirs Board the number of days lost for which workmen's compensation was paid totalled 3,166, represented by 503 individual claims. He also said that during the same period a total of 5,924 unpaid sick days were lost by 659 men out of the 1,203 employed. This information was supplied to him by the General Manager of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board. This proves conclusively that these men are utilizing days for sickness grossly in excess of the number provided for in the award. The management was good enough to add:

In addition to absences on account of paid sick leave, unpaid sick leave and workmen's compensation leave, there was some absenteeism on the job on account of approved leave without pay (other than sick leave) and leave of absence without a reason, both of which affect annual and long service leave entitlements.

The Minister said they were utilizing all sick leave and the board of its own volition pointed out that it was granting much approved leave without pay, which the men were taking at the expense of annual and long service leave. That proves the truth of the document that has been circulated.

I support the amendment. I think members on this side have exploded all the misrepresentation of Government members. I have heard Government members (not present members) who have spoken one way here and voted another way, and have then gone back to their constituents and have said either "This is the way I spoke in the House" or "This is the way I voted." That applies to the member for Burra. He was forced to speak because the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday)

challenged him to state his position, and from start to finish he showed that he either did not understand the Bill (we know, of course, his ability and intelligence and that he understood it) or was speaking directly for the electors of Burra.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: It is not unusual and there is a precedent for a Speaker to speak in Committee and, as this Bill is so important to the district I represent, I intend to speak on it. Without breaking away from Standing Orders, I shall make a few general remarks and link them up with clause 3 and the amendment. Sitting in the House as Speaker, and noticing the way the debate has progressed, I must profess profound disappointment. I dissociate myself entirely from some statements made about the men at the abattoirs. I have been associated with disputes there for many years in my capacity as secretary of the organization I represent. Let me say at once that the Secretary of the Meat Industry Employees' Union (Mr. Pirie) is an honourable man whose word can be accepted, as I have found out over a period of years. I dissociate myself entirely from the remarks made about the men, as this debate has developed into the producers *versus* the men and the men *versus* the producers. For years my organization has advocated this type of legislation. The present dispute has nothing to do whatever with my attitude, as the organization has advocated at board meetings, at conferences, and to the Government that this type of legislation should be introduced. If the Government can be criticized, it is for not introducing it a long time ago. That is the official view of my organization.

Mr. Jennings: It is rather a coincidence that the Government has introduced this now, isn't it?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: As secretary of my organization, I was responsible for averting a dispute at the abattoirs, and this was appreciated by the men: I think that prompted union representatives to approach me the other day to see if I could do something to end the deadlock. This came about in an interesting way. The father of one of the men now working at the abattoirs worked for us on a farm in the Murray Mallee many years ago. The son rang me and asked to see me about the present dispute, and I said I would willingly see him. I did not have any idea it would develop as it did. As a result of the discussion, four representatives of the union were appointed and they, with the Secretary of the union (Mr. Pirie), interviewed me.

After a long discussion they asked me if I would take steps to end the deadlock. I said, "Willingly. What can I do?" They suggested that in my capacity as secretary of a vast primary producers' organization I might interview the board, and they gave me an authority in writing signed by the secretary. I approached the Chairman of the Abattoirs Board who, after a discussion with the board, willingly consented to a conference. When the conference took place, the men put their case for an extra week's sick leave. This was listened to attentively by the board and, when I asked for a reply, I was told that the board had been approached some time ago but agreement could not be reached. The men were told that they should take the matter to the wages board, which has jurisdiction to hear such matters. The Chairman of the board pointed out to me that section 34 of the Act states:

If any dispute arises between any of the employees of the board, or any trades or other union, or any association or organization of or on behalf of such employees, and the board as to the wages or remuneration to be paid to such employees or other employees of the board, or as to their hours of work or any other condition of their employment, such dispute shall be forthwith referred to the Industrial Board constituted under the Industrial Code, 1920-1954, in respect of the industry or section of the industry concerned, or as regards any employees engaged in industries or callings not within the jurisdiction of an industrial board, to the Industrial Court constituted by the Industrial Code, 1920-1954, or to any other authority to which the functions of the said Industrial Board or Court are by any Act transferred.

In section 29, however—

The CHAIRMAN: I take it the honourable member will link his remarks to clause 3?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: This has reference to clause 3, to which I am coming.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like the honourable member to connect his remarks before he goes much further.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I will do it immediately. I apologise for reading clause 3 again, but about 14 different interpretations have been placed on the amendment.

Mr. Jennings: The fifteenth is coming up now.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: It is. The way I read it is that the Minister, if of the opinion that in the interests of the public it is expedient to do so, may grant a licence for such period as he thinks fit to any person to slaughter elsewhere than at the abattoirs of the board any stock for sale for human consumption. That brings me to the point that has

developed—that the Minister may establish another abattoirs within the metropolitan area. Let us have another look at this clause. It provides for the enactment of new section 70a, subsection (4) of which states:

Any carcass or meat slaughtered in accordance with the terms of a licence issued under and inspected pursuant to the directions (if any) given under this section may be sold within the metropolitan abattoirs area.

That, to my mind, means that the Minister does not, and cannot, license a big abattoirs such as we now have at Gepps Cross. What he can do under this Bill is license a small person to slaughter within the metropolitan area because it will affect only meat supplied within the metropolitan area; it is nothing to do with export meat. How can one establish an abattoirs without an export licence? The Minister has no power to grant such a licence because it comes within the Commonwealth Government's jurisdiction over exports, as was proved in the High Court in the Noarlunga Meat Company case. It is said by some that this Bill will result in establishing another big abattoirs within the metropolitan area. I cannot accept that viewpoint. I interpret this to mean that the Minister will grant small licences for slaughtering within the metropolitan area to try to prevent crises that occur annually. The crisis this year is not new because the men have banned overtime; it is a yearly crisis, and has been for the past seven years to my knowledge. My organization is tired of these crises during the peak periods when the lambs are in bloom. That is why we have advocated for some time more slaughtering licences within the metropolitan area to help get rid of the glut that occurs then.

My organization respects the Abattoirs Board; we appreciate its difficulties, with its 1,100 employees and the quantity of stock it slaughters. However, we are not completely on the side of the Abattoirs Board, and have said so repeatedly. We can claim much credit for the fact that we advocated a complete inquiry into the whole of the abattoirs, and that inquiry has taken place. I should like the Minister to table that report in Parliament, for us all to see. I claim for my organization that we have played at least a large part in securing this inquiry into the abattoirs. We do not think that the abattoirs is doing the job completely; we are not satisfied with the proposal regarding the sale yards. I should be neglecting my duty to my district and to the organization I represent if I did not say these few words upon this Bill. I consider the matter so serious that I intend to support the Bill, and

my executive has instructed me to do so because it is vital to the policy we have advocated for many years. Section 29 states that the board may pay to persons certain wages—

The CHAIRMAN: Can the honourable member connect that with clause 3 of the Bill?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yes. The member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh) touched on the crux of the problem. He made a personal call to me to listen to their case, which did not fall on deaf ears. I cannot accept the argument that this Bill will affect the men in any way in regard to their future industrial disputes, because the member for West Torrens—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Leader of the Opposition raises a point of order?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Yes. I must ask the Speaker, through you, Mr. Chairman, if he is in order in speaking from the place of the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse)?

The Hon. T. C. Stott: I am not in his place.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Ridley is not speaking from the place of the member for Mitcham.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Mr. Chairman, I draw your attention (I am only asking for a direction on this) to section 34 of the Constitution Act, at page 22, which reads:

The members of the House of Assembly—

The CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition is taking a point of order?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: What is the point of order?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Whether the Speaker is in order under section 34 of the Constitution Act, as printed on page 22, which reads:

(1) The members of the House of Assembly shall, upon the first assembling after every general election, proceed forthwith to elect one of their number to be Speaker, and in case of his death, resignation or removal by a vote of the House, the said members shall forthwith proceed to elect another of their number to be Speaker.

(2) The Speaker so elected shall preside at all meetings of the House of Assembly.

(3) The election of the Speaker shall be forthwith notified.

I am only asking whether—I do not want to deny to the honourable member for Ridley any privileges as far as the House is concerned—he is elected as a member or, as in this case, the Speaker of the House, who is to preside at all meetings. That is the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: In reply to the point raised by the Leader of the Opposition, we are

in Committee at present and are not sitting as a House presided over by the Speaker. The honourable member is speaking as the member for Ridley and is entitled to exercise his right to speak as a private member and to vote while in Committee, if he chooses so to do. The House of Assembly Standing Orders are silent on the matter of the Speaker speaking and/or voting in a Committee of the whole House. E. G. Blackmore's *Manual of the Practice, Procedure and Usage of the House of Assembly* (2nd Edition, 1890) states at page 46:

When the House is in Committee there is nothing to prevent Mr. Speaker joining in the discussion and voting. But it is customary then to regard the Speaker merely in his capacity as a Member, and in the Journals he is accordingly so entered, if moving in Committee.

The following Speakers of the House of Assembly are recorded as having spoken or voted in the Committee of the whole House, namely: the Hons. Sir Jenkin Coles, F. W. Coneybeer, G. R. Laffer, Harry Jackson, Sir Richard Butler, and E. J. Shepherd. In my opinion, there is ample Parliamentary authority and precedent for the Speaker speaking and/or voting in the Committee of the whole House.

Mr. Frank Walsh: That is according to whom?

The CHAIRMAN: Blackmore.

Mr. Frank Walsh: I only asked.

The CHAIRMAN: If the Leader of the Opposition wants a further reference, I refer him to Sir Erskine May's *Parliamentary Practice*, 16th Edition, at page 438, which states:

Although the Speaker is restrained by usage while he is in the Chair in the exercise of his independent judgment, he is entitled in a Committee of the whole House to speak and vote like any other member. Of late years, however, he has generally abstained from the exercise of this right. The latest recorded example is that of Mr. Speaker Denison in committee on the Customs and Inland Revenue Bill, 1870.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member raising a point of order?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes. The point of order I am taking is the one which has just been raised by the Leader of the Opposition. The position, under our Constitution, and the section which the Leader has cited, is that the Speaker is to preside over all meetings of the House. There is authority in the Constitution for the appointment of a Chairman of Committees, but the Constitution is silent upon the duties of the Chairman of Committees. It is clear from the Constitution that the House may only be presided over when it is the House by

some person other than the Speaker in the absence of the Speaker. That is clear from section 35 of the Constitution. Our Standing Orders provide that the Chairman of Committees shall preside over Committees of the whole House, and Erskine May's *Parliamentary Practice*, in the same edition which you cited, Sir, makes it clear, at page 603, that a Committee of the whole House not only consists of all members of the House but is the House in another guise. It says in fact that a meeting of the Committee of the whole House is a meeting of the House.

In referring to the practice of the House of Commons one is referring to a House that has no written Constitution. There is nothing in writing that provides that the Speaker shall preside over all meetings of that House: there is only custom and usage. However, in this State, the point is that there is a written Constitution binding the House to be presided over by the Speaker when it is a House, and that somebody else may only preside in the absence of the Speaker. Consequently, we are in a different situation from the House of Commons because we have that written limitation in our Constitution. It must be interpreted differently from the custom and usage of the House of Commons. Indeed, at the time our Constitution was written, the custom and usage of the House of Commons was that the Speaker did not, in fact, appear and vote in Committee. Consequently, the Constitution of South Australia must be interpreted in the light of the views which must have been taken by the framers of the Constitution at the time according to English Parliamentary practice. Therefore, it is my submission that the Speaker is not entitled to appear, to speak, or to vote in Committee. He may be fictionally absent, in that he is not in the Chair and is not sitting in a place on the floor of the House, but once he takes a place on the floor of the House and either speaks or votes, he is present, and, with respect, I believe that under the Constitution you, Mr. Chairman, are not then entitled to preside over the House. In consequence of the Standing Orders, the Committee would have to resolve and the Speaker take the Chair once more.

I submit that you should rule that the Speaker is not entitled to be in Committee, and that the precedents that you cited were precedents established through the point that we were in a somewhat different position from the Parliament of England in having a written Constitution and a written limitation upon the Speaker not having been taken before the

Speaker at that time. But now that it has been raised, and I have searched the precedents and cannot find that it has ever been raised previously, then I submit that you should rule that the Speaker is not entitled to be in Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I have ruled that the member for Ridley is entitled to speak and to vote in Committee.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I move:

That the Chairman's ruling be disagreed with.

The CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member objects to the ruling, will he hand his objection in in writing to the Chair.

*The Speaker resumed the Chair:*

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee considered the Bill before it and during that period I ruled that the Speaker, as the member for Ridley, was entitled to speak and vote in Committee on the Bill, whereupon objection was raised by the member for Norwood that the ruling of the Chairman be disagreed with on the ground that section 34 of the Constitution prohibits the Speaker from appearing in the Committee of the whole House. I submit the matter to you for your determination.

The SPEAKER: The Chairman of Committees has reported to me that he has ruled that the member for Ridley is entitled to speak in Committee. I agree and uphold the decision of the Chairman of Committees.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Is the honourable member raising a point of order?

Mr. DUNSTAN: I want to raise two points of order. The first is that in Committee the Chairman is the person who has to rule, and disagreement with his ruling shall be moved in Committee and the Committee has to decide upon the Chairman's ruling. With respect, it is not you, Mr. Speaker, who must uphold the Chairman's ruling: it is the Committee of the House, and it is the Chairman who should give his ruling and stand or fall by it in Committee. That is my first point of order, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Well, the point of order is not sustained. I draw members' attention to Standing Order 161 which states:

If any objection is taken to a ruling or decision of the Chairman of Committees, such objection must be taken at once; and having been stated in writing, the Chairman shall leave the Chair, and the House resume, and the matter be laid before the Speaker; and having been disposed of, the proceedings in Committee shall be resumed where they were interrupted.

Mr. DUNSTAN: The second point of order is that the ruling that you have just given should be disagreed with, and I move:

That the Speaker's ruling be disagreed with.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has submitted in writing his reasons for moving that the ruling of the Speaker be disagreed with. They are that, by section 34 of the Constitution, the Speaker must preside over all meetings of the House; that a meeting of the Committee of the whole House is a meeting of the House; and that the Chairman of Committees may therefore preside over a Committee of the whole House in the absence of the Speaker. Does the honourable member wish to speak?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes. Previously in Committee I have said that section 34 of the Constitution makes it mandatory for the Speaker to preside over all meetings of the House of Assembly. Section 35 provides for somebody else to preside in his absence. Section 36 contemplates the appointment of a Chairman of Committees but specifies no duties. Standing Orders provide that the Chairman of Committees shall preside over meetings of the Committee of the whole House. Erskine May's *Parliamentary Practice* makes it perfectly clear, at page 603 of the 16th edition, that a meeting of the Committee of the whole House is in fact a meeting of the House. It states:

It is, in fact, the House itself in a less formal guise, presided over by a chairman instead of by the Speaker and conducting its business according to more flexible rules of procedure.

Indeed, the practice is that the House resolves itself into a Committee of the Whole. It does not constitute some separate committee, but it resolves itself into a Committee of the Whole and it is still the House. Therefore, the Constitution contemplates that the House may order its proceedings by providing that somebody must preside over the Committee of the Whole in your absence, Mr. Speaker, but only in your absence. You may be fictionally absent in that while you are on the floor of the House you are not occupying your seat as Speaker. So soon as you take a seat on the floor of the House amongst those places allotted to members, and if you rise to take part in the proceedings of the House while it is presided over by somebody else, there is an infringement of the proceedings and Constitution.

Previous justification given for this procedure, both here and in the House of Representatives, where a somewhat similar provision applies under the Commonwealth Constitution, is that it was the practice in the House of

Commons in times long gone by for Speakers occasionally to appear in Committee, but there they are not bound by any written Constitution whatever, merely by custom and usage of the House and, indeed, at the time that our Constitution was written the custom and usage of the House of Commons was that the Speaker did not appear in Committee. That, of course, was in the contemplation of the framers of our Constitution and they provided for a Chairman of Committees on the basis that there would be no appearance by the Speaker in the Committee.

There was a later appearance by a Speaker in England, after our Constitution had been framed, in a Committee of Ways and Means, but that was an isolated occurrence and has not been followed since. I submit that, since we are here bound by the written constitution and procedure of the House, the Speaker in presiding at a proceeding of the House in which he has no right to be present would invalidate the proceedings of the House, because it is not lawful under the Constitution. I submit that your ruling should be disagreed with and that you should not rule that you should appear in a Committee of the whole House since that is a meeting of the House and the Constitution provides that you shall preside at all meetings of the House where you are present.

The SPEAKER: Is the motion of the honourable member for Norwood seconded?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: (Leader of the Opposition): Yes, I second the motion.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18).—Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Coreoran, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh, and Fred Walsh.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Jenkins, Laucke, Millhouse, and Nankivell, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Pairs.—Aye—Mr. Ralston. No—Sir Cecil Hincks.

The SPEAKER: There are 18 Ayes and 18 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I cast my vote in favour of the Noes. Therefore, the question passes in the negative.

Motion thus negatived.

In Committee.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I shall not keep members very much longer on this point. The point I am making in this Bill is that I cannot

accept the argument that the Minister will establish an abattoirs within the metropolitan area under this clause. The Bill does not provide for the establishment of an export abattoirs, because it says "selling meat within the metropolitan area". My interpretation of that is that the Bill contemplates licences for small people to slaughter meat, and that the meat will be sold within the metropolitan area. That has nothing whatever to do with export meat, and I cannot accept the point of view that we could establish an abattoirs without having export meat associated with it. That was proved by the High Court in the Noarlunga Meat Company case. As every honourable member knows, that matter comes under Commonwealth jurisdiction. My interpretation of this Bill is that it will only provide licences for slaughtering meat for consumption within the metropolitan area. I contend that such licences should be granted, and as my organization and my district are vitally concerned with this matter, I support clause 3 as it stands. Before I conclude I wish to say, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, that the Leader has two other amendments. I have no objection whatever to the other two amendments—

The CHAIRMAN: The other amendments are not under consideration at present.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I realize that. I oppose the Leader's amendment to proposed new section 70a (1).

Mr. BYWATERS: This has been rather an unusual debate. The Speaker, as the member for Ridley, spoke first from the seat of the member for Mitcham.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member was not speaking from the seat of the member for Mitcham.

Mr. BYWATERS: Perhaps he swayed a little.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to address his remarks to the question before the Committee.

Mr. BYWATERS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. As other members today have perhaps taken a little time to link up their remarks with the clause before the Committee, I hope you will give me that same latitude. The member for Ridley then went to speak from the back bench of the Government side—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BYWATERS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I come now to the clause before the Committee. The Opposition desires to amend this Bill. The Opposition's desire is to adapt this Bill to conform to something like its policy, which is to provide for country abattoirs, instead of

leaving the position wide open for the establishment of abattoirs anywhere in the State, as has been stated. Under the Bill, it is most likely that another abattoirs will be set up in the metropolitan area. The member for Ridley, in addressing himself to this clause, went all around the matter and, in fact, spoke not to the clause but to the Bill, which he referred to on many occasions. However, he tried to get back to the clause, and in doing so he made a rather unusual statement. He claimed that he was speaking for the Wheat and Woolgrowers' Association, and to me that seemed rather strange, for it was not that organization that elected him to represent the district of Ridley. He did not say that he was also speaking for the electors of Ridley. It makes me wonder who did elect the member for Ridley to this Parliament. I could go a long way further, Mr. Chairman, but I know that you would call me to order.

The member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) stated that it would not be the intention of the Minister or the Government to allow an abattoirs to be established in the metropolitan area. He went on to say that sufficient land would not be available. I beg to differ from the honourable member, because I know areas out near the Metropolitan Abattoirs, at Dry Creek and at Wingfield, where abattoirs could be established under this Bill. If this did happen, it would be very difficult indeed for a country abattoirs to become established. As the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) mentioned, some members on this side are competing for the establishment of an abattoirs in their districts. In the case of other Opposition members who are not in direct competition with each other on this matter, those members are endeavouring to have an abattoirs or a killing works established in their localities.

Mr. Shannon: The clause won't prohibit it.

Mr. BYWATERS: That is so, but the position would be improved if the amendment were carried. It would provide for works being established in the country. My district is favourably situated for the establishment of killing works. It would be close to the river, on the main railway line to Melbourne, and there would be good holding paddocks nearby. It would provide a service for people in the Mallee, the Upper South-East and down to Victor Harbour. Some members say that there is considerable expense in taking stock to Victoria. That is true, but it is also true that there is considerable cost in taking stock from our country areas to the Metropolitan

Abattoirs. It would be a help to have killing works established in a country area. There would be saving in transport costs and fewer losses through bruising, etc. The Bill would be improved by the acceptance of the amendment. Country members should realize that the amendment would help producers in their districts, and that if killing works were established in the metropolitan area there would be little hope of their ever being established in the country.

The Committee divided on the question "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause":

Ayes (18).—Messrs. Boekelberg, Brookman (teller), Coumbe, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Jenkins, Laucke, Millhouse and Nankivell, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele and Mr. Stott.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh (teller) and Fred Walsh.

Pairs.—Aye—Sir Cecil Hincks. No—Mr. Ralston.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 18 Ayes and 18 Noes. As the numbers are equal I give my casting vote in favour of the Ayes. The question, therefore, passes in the affirmative.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I move:

At the end of subsection (2) to insert " : provided that the licence shall contain a condition providing for the inspection of carcasses at the place of slaughter."

Earlier I referred to a letter I had received from the South Australian Wholesale Meat Company Limited. Portion of it stated:

We commenced wholesaling of carcass meat in October, 1960, and our attraction to clients was to offer country killed meat, which has received a ready acceptance from butchers and public alike. The meat we offered then was killed at country meat works at Strathalbyn and Noarlunga. In 1961 we obtained the lease of a meat works at Kangarilla and since then we have killed at Kangarilla and Strathalbyn. It is necessary and required by law that meat for human consumption be inspected by competent meat inspectors prior to sale. We agree with this provision but claim that the best time for this inspection is at the point of killing, not some other point some time later. We have written to the board requesting fixed times for inspection and have received a reply that only provisional time can be given.

Although this is only a small concern it has some fairly big interests, and I believe it would be prepared to kill for export, which it

would be able to do if inspections could be made at its premises. The letter continues:

Our request is for a State inspector to be supplied at the Kangarilla slaughterhouse and the meat inspected on the spot at the time of killing. We would be prepared to pay £50 a week for an inspector at Kangarilla and find suitable accommodation in the area if required.

Meat killed outside the metropolitan area and brought into the metropolitan abattoirs area must pass an inspection. It must be slaughtered and dressed, and other requirements must be met before it is brought to Adelaide. If it is approved, it must be taken to Blackwood and other places to be sold over the counter. Although I do not wish to enter into a controversy about meatworks in the country, I say that some industries should be located away from the metropolitan area. This proposal is put forward by a company engaged in wholesale and retail trade, employing probably 15 people at Kangarilla and up to 40 at Noarlunga. I do not know how many are employed at Strathalbyn.

Mr. Jenkins: There are 19.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I think Government members will agree that it is hardly economical to set up only for export purposes and that, if the owner of a slaughterhouse is prepared to bring it up to the standard required for export purposes, at least an inspector should be supplied on the job for meat that may come to the metropolitan area. A meatworks must have metropolitan trade to be able to engage in export trade. The Metropolitan Abattoirs Board would prefer to deal with metropolitan supply and not have anything to do with export trade; the evidence proves that. I do not think any of these people 20 or 30 miles out would object to paying for an inspector on the spot. A retailer who has a slaughterhouse at Coromandel Valley must load the meat hot and bring it in a suitable conveyance to Adelaide. When he could not accommodate the meat in Adelaide because certain alterations were being made, he had to take it to Gepps Cross for inspection and then take it back to Blackwood, as this town is in the metropolitan abattoirs area. I know that most of his meat is bought at auction sales held at Nairne and then taken to Coromandel Valley for slaughter. In this case he will readily agree to pay, even £10 a day if necessary. Surely we shall not reach the position where these people are told: "You are no longer free to buy in the country; we do not want you to deal with country areas." Because the metropolitan area has deliveries of meat,

surely we are not going to deny them the right to have an inspection at the place of slaughter. If it is good enough in an emergency to issue a licence, surely it is good enough to continue licensing a little longer, because it may encourage people to attempt slaughtering for the export trade. One man is prepared to pay an inspector £50 a week, so a substantial cost must have been added to this business transaction somewhere if he could pay £50 for an inspector, knowing full well that he would save money at the end of the year. This is important to me and the matter should be so treated because, if emergency legislation can be introduced here in order to obtain a solution to a problem, it is good enough to say, "Let it remain for all time."

Instead of cluttering up the South Road and other roads on a Wednesday morning with sheep coming from the south to Gepps Cross for slaughter, the producers may become more interested in their local affairs and say, "What is the average price at the abattoirs market? We will accept that price to run the sheep to Noarlunga or Strathalbyn to save the added cost." It would also mean that the lambs would be in a better condition if they had not to travel so many miles. It is essential that this amendment be agreed to.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: In general, I fully support the Leader's amendment and its object—to provide inspection at the place of slaughter rather than at some other place. Section 70 (c) of the Act provides for the inspection of carcasses with certain of the organs attached at depots set up by the board. That provision has been in the Act for a long time. It was not much thought about years ago but recently, because of the attractiveness of the metropolitan market, some abattoirs have used the Act to enable them to bring meat into the metropolitan market. Of course, it limits them because of the physical difficulties of handling this meat and because it has to be warm, so it is not a section that can be used widely. On the other hand, if this Act had not provided for that but had allowed abattoirs to bring in meat without such an inspection, there would have been no barrier to the metropolitan market at all. The Metropolitan Abattoirs Board does not like this system being operated under section 70 (c); neither do I like it, nor many other people. Certainly, those operating under the Act do not like it but it is to them at present the only means whereby they have been getting meat into the metropolitan area.

For that reason, they have stuck to it although nobody really likes it. The only point in the past has been whether or not it should be cut out. Obviously, one cannot take away a privilege given without considering it at some length. It has not been taken away because a privilege is implied in it and we have not liked to dishonour what has been put into the legislation or to allow people to start with the direct purpose of using this section of the Act and then cut it away from under them. So it has been left there although we do not particularly like it.

The Bill provides that the Minister may give licences and lay down certain conditions relating to inspections. I do not oppose the suggestion of the Leader that the Act shall provide for inspection at the place of slaughter, but we should not lay down the conditions in such a way that it is obligatory to provide for these inspections. For reasons I shall outline, I move:

To amend the amendment by inserting after "shall" the words "whenever practicable".

The amendment will then read:

... provided that the licence shall whenever practicable contain a condition providing for the inspection of carcasses at the place of slaughter.

The purpose of that amendment is to ensure that the provision does not react unfavourably against the interests of the authorities or businesses concerned—for it could. Many inspectors' duties are required for only a short period of a day and for no time on another day. Under certain conditions, when there is a small kill, it may be desirable to use the present section of the Act and to bring carcasses in for inspection. That can be dealt with by the Minister. The Leader's amendment, with my amendment to it, will imply that the Minister must provide for inspections at the point of slaughter whenever practicable.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: There is much to be said in favour of the Minister's amendment to my amendment. I point out that the man at Blackwood—and I do not know whether he would be interested in the export trade or not—is slaughtering meat for retail in his own business, and he does not want to come to Adelaide with it. Of course, regarding the position at Kangarilla or Noarlunga, I believe that where any of their meat is being disposed of in the metropolitan area they should pay for the necessary inspections. The Metropolitan Abattoirs should not have to send an inspector to those establishments without being

paid for his services. Where export lamb is concerned, the meat should be inspected at the place of slaughter.

Mr. JENKINS: I support the amendment as amended by the Minister. It is a good compromise. Roberts Bros. of Strathalbyn have informed me that they are faced with heavy expense in bringing carcasses to the Gilles Street depot for inspection. One of the disabilities of that method is that the meat is not cooled off as it should be, and when it reaches the retailers it is not presented as well as it could be were it cooled off in a slaughterhouse and presented to the local retailers the next day. They have intimated that they would be prepared to find a residence for an inspector at Strathalbyn and to contribute to the cost of his maintenance. I do not know whether one inspector would visit and inspect two or three slaughterhouses or whether one inspector would be employed for one slaughterhouse. Roberts Bros. employ 19 persons. They visit the Albert District and purchase lambs and they take suitable stock from the Strathalbyn area. When the proposed water scheme for that district is operating they will probably enter into the export lamb slaughtering field if they get a licence. Can the Minister say whether, if this amendment is passed, such slaughterhouses will be covered by it?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: When this legislation becomes law I propose to appoint a committee to advise me on the question of licences. It will be a competent committee experienced in assessing the requirements and needs of the public and also the cases presented by applicants for licences. I should not like to interfere with its work by indicating now whether any particular application would be favourably considered. Members will appreciate that I am not in a position to say exactly who would be licensed.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman's amendment carried; Mr. Frank Walsh's amendment as amended carried.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I move:

In subsection (3) to delete "may" and insert "shall".

The subsection would then read:

If the Minister is of opinion that an inspection of any carcasses or meat additional to the inspection provided for in the licence relating to such carcasses or meat is necessary for the purpose of safeguarding the health of the public, he shall give such directions to the owner of the meat as he considers necessary to ensure that an additional inspection is made before the meat is sold, and the owner of the meat shall comply with such directions.

I do not wish to develop the matter further except to say that I think the Minister will appreciate that if he should give a direction where meat is intended for human consumption he should do so.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I support the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 4 and title passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

#### ORIENTAL FRUIT MOTH CONTROL BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 20. Page 1034.)

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): I support the Bill. I discussed its provisions recently with members of the Oriental Fruit Moth Eradication Committee in Renmark, the members of which expressed approval of the Bill as presented, but questioned several clauses on minor points. An article in this morning's *Advertiser*, referring to the disbanding of the committee, includes the following:

The Renmark Oriental Fruit Moth Committee set up some time ago to combat the pest has been disbanded, the Chairman of the committee, Mr. J. V. Seekamp, said today.

The report went on to say that the committee was disbanded because this legislation had been so long coming that any benefit to be derived from it had departed. The committee felt that the build-up of oriental fruit moth would be so great by the time the provisions of the Bill were implemented that it would be beyond the power of the committee to control the pest.

Clause 5 dealing with the registration of orchards within a district was the subject of a suggestion regarding the scope and extent of information to be supplied. I suggest that to assist the committee in its later operations the fullest possible information should be required of the number of trees and their location in the orchard. Another suggestion on this clause is that a time limit should be imposed in which orchardists should be required to register. Subclauses (4) and (5) of clause 6 appear to be somewhat in conflict. Subclause (4) states that a poll shall be conducted by postal vote and each voter shall have one vote, but subclause (5) states:

Subject to this Act and the regulations the poll shall be conducted in such manner as the Returning Officer for the State deems proper.

I also raise a query on clause 8 dealing with a poll for the dissolution of a committee. Is it intended that such a poll cannot be petitioned for until the committee has been in operation for at least three years? I will now briefly deal with the history of the oriental fruit moth infestation in the Renmark district and the efforts of the Renmark committee to eradicate this dangerous pest. It was first discovered in the Renmark district in 1958 and although the danger of its spreading was recognized by some growers others in the first affected areas were not sufficiently interested in its eradication, with the result that the pest spread over a wider area.

The eradication committee was then formed and with financial assistance from the Agriculture Department over the next two years a campaign was waged in an attempt at eradication. Unfortunately, the money allocated was not sufficient to carry out the full spray programme necessary for complete eradication and the money was not granted soon enough to allow the committee sufficient time to plan and organize an effective programme of eradication. After careful consideration in the early months of this year the Renmark committee decided to request a further substantial sum to be made available early enough to allow for the proper planning and organization of an effective eradication programme. This request was made last May.

Following on questions I asked of the Minister of Agriculture as to what action was being taken in this matter, the committee was informed that funds would not be allocated for eradication work this year but that the pest board legislation would be introduced at an early date. Once again, Government action is too late to be really effective, as it will be several months before any action can be taken under this legislation. As a result,

the committee has decided to go out of existence and not carry on its work. It considers that it cannot take any effective action, and it has now decided to leave the matter in the lap of the gods. It will be up to the peach industry of South Australia to do something about the matter, because the pest will surely spread to all sections of the industry and, according to what I was told today, will even come down as far as the Barossa Valley. The former Chairman of the committee, with whom I have been in communication, has stated that in the opinion of the committee the pest will definitely spread. I support the legislation as presented and hope that it will be carried through with all speed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Interpretation."

Mr. BYWATERS: I notice that "orchard" means any area of land on which not less than 40 host trees are growing. I point out that this represents almost half an acre on the irrigated areas, and it seems to me to be rather a large area. In my experience, one of the problems associated with the control of any pest arises from some of the backyard orchards in fruitgrowing areas. Has the Minister carefully considered the number of trees specified?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): This provision does not exclude from control those people having fewer trees than the number mentioned: it merely precludes them from having a vote.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 to 16) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.37 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, October 3, at 2 p.m.